Author's response to reviews

Title: Current ICD10 codes are insufficient to clearly distinguish acute myocardial infarction type: a descriptive study

Authors:

Roxana Alexandrescu (r.alexandrescu@imperial.ac.uk)
Alex Bottle (robert.bottle@imperial.ac.uk)
Brian Jarman (b.jarman@imperial.ac.uk)
Paul Aylin (p.aylin@imperial.ac.uk)

Version: 4 Date: 25 October 2013

Author's response to reviews: see over
MS: 1642608216925713
Current ICD10 codes are insufficient to clearly distinguish acute myocardial infarction type: a descriptive study Roxana Alexandrescu, Alex Bottle, Brian Jarman and Paul Aylin

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for your answer and for the comments of the Editor.

Please accept our responses including the page number on which the revision appears.

The revised manuscript has been read and approved by all authors.

Sincerely,
Roxana Alexandrescu

Dr. Foster Unit at Imperial College,
Department of Primary Care and Public Health,
Imperial College London, London W6 8RP, UK
Tel: +44 (0)20 7332 8843
Fax: +44 (0)20 7332 8888
Email: r.alexandrescu@imperial.ac.uk
The response to Alessandro Barchielli’s second request was not taken to heart. The sentence, "Interestingly, I21.9 (representing the great majority of I21 cases) had exhibited moderate values of angioplasty use (under 10%) that might suggest that some of the cases within this large subcategory are in fact STEMI cases," is now just confusing. I don’t know how you can make any conclusion about the proportion of I21.9 cases being STEMI. Please modify this section.

The section has been modified (page8) as following:

Interestingly, I21.9, representing the great majority of I21 cases, exhibited only moderate values of angioplasty use (under 10%).