

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_CA_105044</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Myocardial Infarction, Deep Venous Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism in COVID-19 Hospitalizations: Stats From the Nationwide Inpatient Sample 2020.</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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p> | <p><b>In my opinion, less important. Since the analysis was subjected to Sars-CoV-2 type A infection occurs in 2020.</b><br/><b>Yes</b><br/><b>No. it needs revision</b><br/><b>No. it needs revision</b><br/><b>Yes. But it needs revision</b></p> <p>Abstract<br/>Please revise. Look at comments in manuscript</p> <p>Database<br/>This would suggest that the infection is type A sars cov 2.</p> <p>Line 74<br/>Please add. To strengthen the data, there should be a breakdown of how many hospitals are located in each of the 48 states..</p> <p>Line 90<br/>Please revise. Add acronym for TOTCH</p> <p>Line 92<br/>Please revise. Change to gender</p> <p>Line 93<br/>Please revise. Add the statistical analysis used for this study</p> <p>Result<br/>Must revise. The data in the result section should be presented in a table rather than in paragraph form. It was unclear whether the significant value represented a difference or a correlation between groups. I suppose these were comparisons or differences)</p> <p>Line 96-98<br/>Please revise. There could be misunderstanding in this sentence. Rephrase the sentence.</p> <p>Line 108<br/>Must revise. It was inconceivable for the mean to be only 145,378; the standard deviation was 28,9608, however.</p> <p>Line 115<br/>Please revise. This number should be revised.</p> <p>Figure 1<br/>Please revise. The figure 1 from Evbayekha et al. was cited. This figure-described mechanism was not mentioned in the manuscript.</p> <p>Dicussion<br/>Please consider adding. Since the data was obtained from 2020, type A COVID-19 is indicated. Compared to other types of COVID-19, there should be an explanation for concern regarding this infection.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>Please revise. How did the author determine that a relationship existed between groups? All data in the results section consisted of statistical comparisons.</p> <p>References<br/>Please revise. Follow the template's reference guidelines. Many references lacked a publication year, displayed a double-year publication, or lacked a journal name.</p> |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments   |   |  |
| 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | It may need some revision   |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments   |   |  |

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Name:</b>                                | <b>Indrayadi Gunardi</b>               |
| <b>Department, University &amp; Country</b> | <b>Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia</b> |