

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_95610
Title of the Manuscript:	Coronary Artery Ectasia as a Predictor of Major Adverse Cardiac Events in patients with Acute ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction
Type of the Article	Original 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.journalca.com/index.php/CA/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is a pertinent manuscript in the topic of Coronary Artery Disease since the mortality difference has also been studied when coronary ectasia is present alongwith CAD. This may lead to further multicentric trials involving larger number of patients.</p> <p>Yes, it is a suitable title.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive. The part where multi-variate regression analysis is mentioned needs to be rewritten since there is a disconnect between the risk factors.</p> <p>They are largely appropriate.</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>There are sufficient recent references.</p> <p>Additional comment: If the exclusion criteria included patients with pre-existing LV systolic dysfunction, how is that the Ejection fraction range is from 35-62? . If it was the EF after the MACE, then the change in EF should have been studied which might not have shown significant change in the two groups since EF difference between the two groups are so less (35-54 vs 37-62)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Narayanan Rajaram
Department, University & Country	Andaman and Nicobar Islands Institute of Medical Sciences (ANIIMS), G B Pant Hospital, India