

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_89363
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of coronary calcium scoring in the prognosis of Cardiovascular disorders (Mortality, hospital admissions with ACS and need for revascularization): A retrospective observational study
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.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>ORIGINALITY (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the paper clearly point out differences from related research? Yes - Are the problems or approaches new? yes <p>For example, does the paper: address a new problem or one that has not been studied in much depth? yes introduce an interesting research paradigm? yes introduce an area that appears promising, or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives? yes</p> <p>SIGNIFICANCE (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the work important? yes - Does it advance the state of the art? yes - Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view? yes <p>TECHNICAL QUALITY (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the paper technically sound, with compelling arguments? - Is there a careful evaluation? Does the paper carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? yes - Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well known technique? - If the paper describes an application, is there: a clear and compelling motivation for why the chosen approach is important? a careful description of the design and implementation of the system? a thorough evaluation of the system with respect to a clearly-stated set of functional and quality requirements? yes <p>QUALITY OF PRESENTATION (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the paper clearly written? yes - Does the paper motivate the research? yes - Are results clearly described and evaluated? yes - Is the paper well organized? yes <p>good</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yousef Farhaoui
Department, University & Country	Moulay Ismail University, Morocco