

### Review Form 3

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</a>                                  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_CA_127579  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | C-reactive protein in acute myocardial infarction: association with heart failure - about 118 cases |
| 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

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b> | <b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| 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.                        |                           |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  |                           |   |
| 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.   |                           |   |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  |                           |   |
| 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. |                           |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   |                           |   |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments<br>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?   |                           |   |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments  | See attachment            |   |

#### **PART 2:**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|--|--|--|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

#### **Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Zainab Samir Yahya Hammo</b>   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Tikrit, Iraq</b> |