

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_79391
Title of the Manuscript:	Noninvasive Predictors of Coronary Slow Flow Phenomenon in Patients Presenting with Chronic Coronary Syndrome
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> )

### **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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abbreviations appearing for the first time in the abstract should have full names.</li> <li>2. The range item should be considered to delete, and authors just need to list only men or women sex (any one will do) in the table.</li> <li>3. According to table 1, they seem to only match age in grouping, and I think they could not match sex in grouping, which was statistically higher in CSFP patient compared to controls.</li> <li>4. Only positive results need to be reported in the results section. No statistically significant results need not be reported.</li> <li>5. What's the difference between "T wave inversion" and "T wave inversion alone"? Do they mean apex phenomenon or something else? Please define "T wave inversion alone".</li> <li>6. In the discussion section, the author quotes too many other studies and discusses the results of various studies only at a very superficial level, which is far from enough. They should put forward a deeper mechanism, discussion or scientific hypothesis on the results of their own research, so as to increase the scientificity and readability of the article.</li> <li>7. I will recommend to take a language-editing of the study. Some grammar mistakes make it hard to read/follow.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<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> <b>Yes.</b> <b>Informed written permission was received. from all cases before participating in the study. Also, the study was done after approval by the local ethical committee of Faculty of Medicine, Al-Azhar University (Cairo).</b>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ruoxi Zhang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Harbin Medical University, China</b>