

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_91965</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Speckle Tracking in Acute Non-St Elevation Acute Coronary Syndromes Patients as a Factor of Risk Stratification</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalca.com/index.php/CA/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>The topic is interesting but</b> all abbreviations should be chosen carefully, avoiding one word abbreviation (echo tte) and every abbreviation including abstracta should be explained where it is first used (ecg std twi tte rbs) In the method part, it should be stated how high and low risk are calculated. The authors stated that there is a difference in the std and twi groups for dbp, and how will they explain that strain values are affected by heart rate blood pressure arterial bmi, and how will they explain that dbp has no effect on strain? The place of the data of a few patients in an original article could not be understood, and it is not correct to say that our study is compatible with this study without any explanation from the first sentence of the discussion part. Since the discussion part started low and continues, it should be re-arranged.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Emre Ozdemir</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Izmir Katip Celebi University, Turkey</b>