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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript by Tan et al. titled "Low Expression of PRMT5 in Peripheral Blood May Serve as a Potential Independent Risk Factor in Assessments of the Risk of Stable CAD and AMI" found that PRMT5 mRNA and protein levels in peripheral blood are markedly reduced in individuals who have had an acute myocardial infarction as compared to individuals who have stable and clinically significant coronary artery disease. The authors go on to suggest that low levels of PRMT5 predict myocardial infarction by the ability of this marker to adjust the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. The problem with their approach is that they use the same sample of patients to look at "prediction" of MI as they used to originally identify the association. This is a "self-fulfilling" prophecy. The authors need to test their marker in an independent sample of cases and "controls" to demonstrate its ability to predict events.

Unless an additional naive cohort is tested, the predictive section of the results and ROC curves should deleted.

A key question is whether this "biomarker" is better able to predict myocardial infarction than the current standard. The other question is what is the clinical relevance of this marker to therapy?

The PDF manuscript I reviewed was formatted as a "track changes" papers, making reading tedious and difficult. Please do not submit manuscripts in this format in future.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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