

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Cardiology Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_84563
Title of the Manuscript:	To Assess the Outcome of Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Patients with Acute ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/editorial-policy> )

**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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Primary PCI is valuable to save lives and I should thank authors for their considerations to humanity and emergent cardiovascular events, but I should add my comments as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. There are numerous more important factors associated with outcomes, such as treatment delay, previous vascular accidents, previous interventions, really they are more important than your selected variables.</li><li>2. This is an especial cardiology journal and paper suffers extra explanations in back ground, which should be more summarized.</li><li>3. This study is a descriptive type and you do not need sample size.</li><li>4. Methodology can be summarized, too.</li><li>5. Tables especially 2 last ones are not clear and can be rewritten better.</li><li>6. Discussion is not in line of your research and may be adjusted more.</li><li>7. Abstract is better more abstract than 300 words and unnecessary data can be removed.</li></ol>	<p>We are thankful for your highly precious and kind input. Thank you for your kind suggestions once again. The required corrections have been highlighted as suggested by AJCR's review team after correspondence with the co-authors of this article.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></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)	