

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_84896
Title of the Manuscript:	In-hospital outcomes of Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in patients presenting with acute ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction in a tertiary care hospital in Karachi
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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	Total 115 patients out of which one quarter had double or triple vessel disease. Those who had DVD or TVD had PPCI to only culprit vessel or not that is not clear and should be added in the discussion. Why multiple vessel were not stented in double and triple vessel disease if feasible should be discussed as well. And it would have been a lot better if Mortality could be divided in between Single, double and triple vessel disease which would have even strengthen the rational to do PPCI to culprit vessel in DVD or TVD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- According to current standard guidelines and recommendations, dealing only culprit vessel during primary PCI is the standard strategy.</li></ul>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	It's a really well written paper which bears absolute importance in making decision re PPCI which is life saving and very useful in emergency setting and in places where emergency CABG is difficult to arrange if indicated. With above additions it will be a paper worth publishing.	

### **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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- No ethical issues</li></ul>