

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_121357
Title of the Manuscript:	Systemic Biomarkers in Predicting Clinical Outcomes Among Patients with Non-ST Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction: A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is a very interesting comprehensive systematic review of systemic biomarkers and their predictive value of clinical outcomes in NSTEMI patients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, the authors are advised to cite the difficulty of acquiring Syntax score because it depends on multiple angiographic data even for trained professionals. Add MACE and prediction of overall mortality as cited by reviewed studies as an important clinical outcome.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	I recommend accept with minor changes. The authors are advised to add to limitations of the review the short-term follow-up period for prediction of outcomes in the reviewed studies.	

Review Form 3

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:	Haassan A. Shora
Department, University & Country	Port-Said University, Egypt