

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_95753</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Hemoglobin Level as A Predictor of Major Adverse Cardiovascular Events and Short-Term Outcomes in Stemi Patient Treated with Pharmacoinvasive Strategy Versus Primary PCI</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

	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 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community. However, anaemia is not the dominant observation in cardiovascular events, but continental variation cannot be ruled out.</p> <p>Could have been short. "Outcome of various interventions in STEMI patients with anaemia". Informative</p> <p>Explained under various headings.</p> <p>Scientific has to be systematic, organised and exact knowledge, gained by experiments. However, the present study is more of observations. only</p> <p>Not as per the instructions for authors.</p> <p>Discussion would be more informative if the order is systematic, in comparisons to other studies.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Not bad	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Any study if done in good faith on medical facts always helps the literature,	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ishtyak Ahmed Mir</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Jammu, Government Medical College, India</b>