

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_90018
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Ramadan Fasting on Diabetic Patients With High Risk of Cardiovascular Disease
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.journalca.com/index.php/CA/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of Ramadan fasting on cardiovascular risk factors in diabetic patients. Unfortunately, I cannot recommend this manuscript for publication.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2nd paragraph, line 3: The word <u>cerebro</u> must be replaced by <u>brain</u>.</li> <li>- 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph: insert the year of the reference Bouguerra et al.</li> <li>- 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, last line: insert the reference.</li> <li>- Please, include the aim and the hypothesis of the study at the end of the Introduction.</li> </ul> <p><b>Methodology and Results</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please, define all abbreviation when used for the first time, for example, CCU.</li> <li>- The age interval mentioned on the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of page 3 (18-80) was too large and different from that mentioned on the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of the item Results (32-91), and lacks units that I suppose it was 32-91 years-old.</li> <li>- The number of women and men are too different and it must be informed if the women are in the reproductive phase or not.</li> <li>- In the Table 1, three groups are mentioned but it is impossible to know what they are, how the groups were defined because there is no mention to groups in the Methodology. The experimental design was not presented.</li> <li>- What is the sample number in each group?</li> <li>- What statistics test was used?</li> <li>- Units must be informed in the Figures and Tables.</li> <li>- Means must be followed by the mean standard error or the standard deviation and by the number of patients.</li> <li>- Blood pressure is not a metabolic parameter and should not be included in the figure 1.</li> <li>- All the figures and tables must have the units, definition of abbreviations and result of statistics.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>The discussion is highly speculative, presents some wrong concepts and has no references. Important to say that when the difference between groups is not significant it means that the groups are equal.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Regina Celia Spadari
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Sao Paulo, Brazil