

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_94940
Title of the Manuscript:	Serum Level of Lipoprotein-Associated Phospholipase A2 and Coronary Artery Disease
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Abstract: There are not given the metric units for HDL-C.</p> <p>2. Patients and methods: 1. The exclusion and inclusion criteria should be given in more details. 2. The study includes a relatively small number of patients (60), and they become even smaller when are divided into subgroups (n=20). The control group is also small (n=10), which makes the results and conclusions unreliable. 3. The analytical method for determination of Lp-PLA2 should be described and cited.</p> <p>3. Results and Discussion: 1. At the beginning of the patients' section was stated that the study is observational, and in the first paragraph of results' section is written that it is a retrospective study. In addition, a blood sample was drawn for measuring Lp-PLA2. This discrepancy should be corrected accordingly. 2. In the text before Table 2 are given data for HDL-C levels without metric units. This should be corrected in the manuscript. 3. In many places there is duplication of information in the text and in the tables. It is advisable to avoid such duplication. 4. Table 3 should be edited and reformatted in a more clear view. 5. The novelty of this study should be clearly explained. The strengths of the study should be specified.</p> <p>Comments regarding the style and language Many technical and stylish errors are noticed. These should be corrected.</p> <p>Overall Recommendation The paper can in principle be accepted after thorough editing.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The paper can in principle be accepted after thorough editing.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Bistra Galunska
Department, University & Country	Medical University of Varna, Bulgaria