

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>PART 2:</b>						
		<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>				
	<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>					
<p><u>Reviewer Details:</u></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Name:</td> <td><b>Anonymous reviewer (Only for this stage as per Review policy)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Department, University &amp; Country</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>				Name:	<b>Anonymous reviewer (Only for this stage as per Review policy)</b>	Department, University & Country	
Name:	<b>Anonymous reviewer (Only for this stage as per Review policy)</b>						
Department, University & Country							
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_117093</b>						
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Value of 2D Global Longitudinal Strain in Predicting the Severity of Coronary Artery Disease in Patients with NSTEMI and Unstable Angina and regional strain value for predicting the culprit artery.</b>						
Type of the 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.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</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes it is important and useful as it used novel modality in echocardiography and also by its use , it can predict severity of CAD by non invasive method before doing invasive coronary angiography</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes but in the background a short introduction should be written about the subject not just the aim of the work</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>You should add two or three recent references</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes but there are minor linguistic errors , also in patients and methods inclusion criteria should replace the exclusion criteria in the sentence : the exclusion criteria were simple and included</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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:**

Name:	Ahmed Ibrahim Bedier Abdel-Naby
Department, University & Country	Mansoura University, Egypt