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**Reviewer's report:**

This article reports a well done analysis on an imponent NSTEMI registry (almost 9000 patients). Alzuhairi et al stratified prognosis, considering different coronary artery disease patterns. Notably, they show that NSTEMI patients without evident coronaric stenosis have similar prognosis to patients with one- or two-vessel disease. This finding makes it an interesting article to publish.

**Major issue:**

- Although useful, I think that the overall mortality should be flanked by CV mortality or MACE.

**Minor issues:**

- The "background" section, in the abstract, seems more like an "aim of the study". I suggest to rethink this section.

- ".. median follow-up period of 4.5 years ..". Are there any difference between the groups?

- Check citations 17 and 18. I do not see them in the text.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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