

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJANR_120597</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Treatment Approaches in Non-ST-Segment Elevation Acute Coronary Syndrome: From Guidelines to Clinical Practice</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Too many errors and repetitions. Under 'Guidelines Overview', after NSTE-ACS [12], starting 'Clinical assessment begins ...to... high risk patients [1].' - 42-43 printed lines - are ditto word by word to those beginning after 'symptoms suggestive of NSTE-ACS. Clinical assessment....to....high risk patients..The references in each section are however different.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	OK	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No Besides the comment above, the materials and methods do not appear logical for this manuscript. The tables 1 and 2 are exactly similar - the only words that are changed are at the bottom of each table: 'illustrates the ACC/AHA...' and 'presents the ESC ...' Both tables are also lacking a dated reference.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	No. Too many errors and repetitions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Yes, but wrongly attributed – for example reference #5.	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This manuscript is full of errors and irregularities and should not be published.</p> <p>2. Tables 1 and 2 are exactly similar (word by word). The only words that are changed are at the bottom of each table: 'illustrates the ACC/AHA...' and 'presents the ESC ...' Both tables are also lacking a dated reference.</p> <p>3. Under 'Guidelines Overview', after NSTEMI-ACS [12], starting 'Clinical assessment begins ...to... high risk patients [1].' - 42-43 printed lines - are ditto word by word to those beginning after 'symptoms suggestive of NSTEMI-ACS. Clinical assessment....to....high risk patients.' The references in each section are however different.</p> <p>4. Some references are used without a valid connection. For example, reference #5 is used many times without a clear association with the preceding statement.</p> <p>5. Further, the ESC recently published new guidelines on August 29, 2020 (European Heart Journal, Volume 42, Issue 14, 7 April 2021, Pages 1289–1367, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehaa575">https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehaa575</a>) "The updates place increased reliance on high-sensitivity cardiac troponin testing (hs-cTn) for diagnosis, embrace coronary computed tomography (CT) imaging to rule out lower-risk patients, as well as highlight the need for personalized antiplatelet regimens, systems of care, and quality improvement."</p> <p>6. The materials and methods do not appear logical for this manuscript.</p>	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Shashi Agarwal</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>USA</b></p>