

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_CA_106600 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Prevalence and Risk Factors of In-Hospital Mortality of ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction (STEMI) Patients during January - December 2021 at Bekasi Regency General Hospital |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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>1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes</p> <p>The manuscript is generally well-written, but there are minor grammatical and typographical errors that should be corrected.</p> <p>The introduction could benefit from a more concise and structured presentation of the research question and objectives.</p> <p>While the study mentions risk factors for STEMI patients, it does not provide statistical analyses or discuss the significance of these risk factors in detail. It would be helpful to include statistical tests and their results to support the conclusions.</p> <p>The manuscript should discuss potential limitations of the study, such as selection bias, data completeness, or generalizability of findings, to provide a more balanced view of the research.</p> <p>The use of more recent guidelines and references in the discussion section would enhance the relevance and credibility of the study's findings.</p> <p>It would be beneficial to discuss the clinical implications of the findings in more detail, especially in terms of improving patient care and outcomes.</p> <p>The discussion section could benefit from a more critical analysis of the limitations of the study, such as potential biases associated with using secondary data and the generalizability of the findings.</p> <p>The manuscript lacks a statement regarding ethical considerations, including patient consent and data privacy.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | Yes | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name: | Hassan Tahir |
| Department, University & Country | Lake Cumberland Hospital, USA |