International Cardiovascular Research Journal
Volume 17 · Issue 2 · e138445

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# Are Electrolyte Imbalances Related to 3-Month Outcomes in Patients with an Acute Myocardial Infarction? A Cohort Study from Iran

Salman Nikfarjam, Elham Ramezanzade, Yasaman Borghei, Bahare Gholami Chaboki, Baharak Alizadeh, Samaneh Karami, Arsalan Salari, Seyedeh Fatemeh Mirrazeghi

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 18 Jun 2023 | 5 Sep 2023 | 4 Oct 2023 |

## About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

## Contents

1 **Original submission** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief ..... 3
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 4
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 5
3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 6
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 7
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 8
4 **Revision 3** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 9
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 10
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 11

## 1 Original submission

2 comments · 30 Jul 2023 – 30 Jul 2023

### Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 30 Jul 2023

Needs revision.

### Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 30 Jul 2023

Please make the revisions based on the comments.

2

# Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

**Response to reviewers**

Thank you for your valuable comments on our manuscript

Responses are as below:

**“Reviewer 1:”**

In the discussion section some sentences added in line with with your comment and highlighted with yellow color.

**“Reviewer 2:”**

Explanations about the comment of the dear reviewer are given below:

In each table, we set univariate regression for each electrolyte separately in “uni-variable model” column.

In “multivariable model/unadjusted” column, you can see the results of multivariate regression model by present of six electrolytes together. We considered “enter” method in multivariable models. Our object of multivariate model was that what a difference it makes concurrent presence of electrolytes in regression model. But, as you see, there was not remarkable difference in these two models. This means that, the electrolytes as “Na, K, Ca, P, Mg and Uric-acid” are not the predictors for response variable, either separately or simultaneously.

The next columns, the adjusted regression models, we considered age and gender in multivariate model. You can see, there was not remarkable difference in the models.

Ultimately, we presented ROC curve analysis to confirm the results of the tables. However, I agree with your comment about the ROC analysis and I can delete this section if you want to.

## 2 Revision 1

1 comment · 21 Aug 2023

### Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 21 Aug 2023

Please make the revisions ASAP.

3

# Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

**Response to reviewers**

Dear reviewers thank you for your valuable comments on our work. Corrections were made in the text of the article. Added sentences were highlighted and some sections removed.

1. In response to the comment “there was no explanation about what outcomes specifically did you mean by non-recovery outcomes. please explain this in your methods.” On-recovery include death added in the method.
2. In response to the comment “in line 100-101 in your result section the sentence "odds of non-recovery was constant by increasing electrolytes" is not accurate. As the p value was not significant the correlation you have found could not be discussed.” I agree with your comment and I can delete this sentence.
3. In response to the comment “you have mentioned that NSTEMI has 23.12 more chance for non-recovery events than STEMI (Odds ratio=23.12). for my concern due to clinical experience please make sure that there was no misspelling nor misconducting.” Thank you for your attention. In our study 91% patients were STEMI (MI) and 9% patients with NSTEMI (MI). We obtained these uncommon results because of excessive frequency of STEMI type of MI. so, we delete related column for prevention of misunderstanding.
4. In response to the comment “As you have mentioned in your revision letter, since the finding was not statistically significant, use of ROC was not necessary please delete this part.” Ok, we surely delete this part.

## 3 Revision 2

2 comments · 2 Sep 2023 – 2 Sep 2023

### Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 2 Sep 2023

Please make the revisions.

### Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 2 Sep 2023

minor revision

4

# Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

**Response to revisions**

Response to *“Write exactly which version of SPSS you used in Abstract 24 and in the main text 22. If the only valid and free version is version 16.”*

Thank you for your attention. We used SPSS v.22. It was corrected in abstract.

Response to *“In the second line of column 3, you wrote that we used unadjusted multivariate analysis. The word unadjusted is wrong. As much as you have used multiple regression analysis, it means adjusted.”*

Thank you for your comment.

Our main independent variables are “Na, K, Ca, P, Mg, and Uric-acid”. We fitted the regression model ones for each variable separately in the univariable models, and ones for all of the variables simultaneously in multivariable mode (unadjusted multivariable model). Also we fitted a regression model for all of the variables simultaneously with adjusting “age” and “sex” (adjusted regression)

## 4 Revision 3

2 comments · 15 Sep 2023 – 5 Nov 2023

### Associate Editor

ACCEPT 15 Sep 2023

Thanks for choosing our journal. I hope we can collaborate in the future as well.
I see that you have revised the manuscript. All the requirements have been fulfilled. Although you have mentioned that the non-recovery outcome was death, using the word "include" in the method may cause misunderstanding, as it may suggest that other outcomes were included. Please change this so that it does not cause any misunderstanding.
best regards

### Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 5 Nov 2023

accept