

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_93292
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute coronary syndromes in women: angiographic features
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Thank you for submitting your valuable work for review.</p> <p>You will find my comments and suggestions about your article.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is recommended to use the term of monovessel, bivessels, trivessels instead of monotruncular, etc.</li> <li>2. The abbreviations ND , RD and MINOCA are incomprehensible. Long definitions are recommended to be written the first time they are used.</li> <li>3. Which criteria were used to classify the severity of coronary lesions and to determine normal vessels?</li> <li>4. Presented findings are not sufficient for the purpose of the study.</li> <li>5. In Table 2, which criterion you used to define total or partial coronary occlusive lesions?</li> <li>6. On Fig 1, please check the term of troncular .</li> <li>7. In discussion, study results are not sufficiently discussed with previous published articles in discussion section. F.e. ,1) there is the sentence "This difference in mortality can reach a factor of 1.5, especially in young women." which is cited from previous studies. But, you did not present and discuss the mortality rate, and also, the detected reasons for the increased mortality in women. 2) It is not clear how author(s) concluded that women have different characteristics of coronary artery lesions, and also, less extensive than men. Because, only women data were presented in submitted article and author did not give any information about coronary artery lesions detected in men.</li> <li>8. Conclusion is compatible with aim however not compatible with this study results, it looks like has been written according to literature rather than obtained findings.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

Comment [Y1]: What is mortality rate in your study and in which age group ?

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Fatma Suna Kır�</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Turkey</b>