

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_111028
Title of the Manuscript:	Value of CHA2DS2-VASC Score as Predictor of Contrast-Induced Nephropathy in Patients with Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction Undergoing Percutaneous Coronary Intervention
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript <u>is</u> important for scientific community (see below). 2. The title of the article <u>is</u> suitable. 3. The abstract of the manuscript <u>is</u> rather comprehensive. 4. The structure/subsections of the manuscript <u>are</u> appropriate. 5. The manuscript should be revised (see below). 6. The references should be expanded (see below). <p>My recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study is somewhat original since CI problem in NSTEMI population has not been studied properly. However, the population is rather heterogeneous and usually frail, and treatment priorities and strategies are quite different. Therefore, preventive measures (e.g., hydration, low/zero contrast PCI, culprit-only/staged PCI) are not always available. The authors should, thus, develop and advise their own algorithm for preserving renal function. 2. The authors should use some tricks to better convey their findings to the readers. Among others, they should shorten the text, replace text & tables with pictures (e.g., development of CIN), start their discussion with their major findings, and explain how their findings will improve the NSTEMI patients' outcomes. 3. The authors should explain the acronyms in the Abstract section and complete the Method section (e.g., NSTEMI definition, CHAD2-VASC2 score calculation, regression analysis for risk prediction). They should use medians and IQRs when the data distribution is not normal. They should also explore the timing of the PCI procedures (e.g., immediate, early invasive, invasive) and their influence on the CIN development. 4. The authors should explain the association between CHADS2-VASC2 score and CIN (e.g., is the score only the sum of different risk factors?) and compare different predictors for CIN (according to the regression analysis and data from literature). 5. As mentioned above, the authors should incorporate their findings into better treating NSTEMI patients. 6. In the Conclusion of the Abstract, the authors were not supposed to assume the impact of CIN on mortality/morbidity short-term outcomes, since they had not provided the related data. 7. Advised additional literature: Aksoy F and Bagci A, 2019; Avci E et al., 2018; Chaudary AK et al., 2019; Cicek G et al., 2018; Parlindungan HV et al., 2018; Khalil WA et al., 2023; Ozcan S et al., 2023; Samir A et al., 2023). 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Good enough.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>See above!</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Igor Kranjec
Department, University & Country	University Medical Centre Ljubljana, Slovenia