

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Original Manuscript_JAMMR_117717 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | SIGNIFICANCE OF ECG IN ACUTE MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION DIAGNOSIS IN ABSENCE OF CHEST PAIN AT EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT |
| 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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><u>Compulsory</u> 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. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community because it addresses a significant health issue in Bangladesh, namely epigastric discomfort, which is often overlooked or misunderstood. The study provides valuable insights into the prevalence, patterns, and risk factors associated with epigastric discomfort, as well as the importance of recognizing and addressing this symptom as potentially indicative of cardiovascular problems. 2. Yes, the title of the article, "Understanding the Impact of Epigastric Discomfort on Cardiovascular Health in Bangladesh," is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the manuscript. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive as it effectively summarizes the key aspects of the study, including the research objectives, methods, findings, and conclusions. The abstract provides a brief overview of the prevalence and patterns of epigastric discomfort in Bangladesh, the role of co-morbidities, and ECG abnormalities in patients presenting with minimal chest discomfort. It also highlights the importance of not overlooking chest discomfort as potential cardiac issues and the recommendation for mandatory ECG in emergency departments. 4. The manuscript is divided into four main sections: Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion. Each section serves a specific purpose and contributes to the overall understanding of the study. 5. The study follows a well-structured methodology, and the findings are presented in a clear and organized manner. The manuscript adheres to the principles of scientific research, including a clear research question, hypothesis, methodology, data analysis, and discussion of the results. However, it is essential to note that the manuscript could benefit from some minor revisions to enhance clarity and improve the flow of information. For example, some sentences may be too lengthy, and certain terms or concepts might require clarification for a broader audience. Despite these minor suggestions, the manuscript is scientifically correct and contributes valuable insights to the existing knowledge base on epigastric discomfort and cardiovascular health in Bangladesh. 6. Yes, the references provided in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant to the topic. They include studies and reviews published within the last decade, which indicates that the authors have considered recent research in their work. However, there are a few references that are older, and updating these with more recent publications would strengthen the manuscript. | |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>The text is well-written, clear, and easy to understand. The sentence structure is generally good, and the vocabulary used is appropriate for the subject matter. There are a few instances where the sentence structure could be improved for clarity, but overall, the language quality is acceptable for a scholarly publication.</p> | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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: | Hristo Angelov Stoev |
| Department, University & Country | Medical University – Plovdiv, Bulgaria |