

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_89501
Title of the Manuscript:	POST-PCI CLINICAL OUTCOMES IN OLDER ADULTS OR LOW WEIGHT PATIENTS WITH REDUCED DOSE PRASUGREL IN COMPARISON TO CLOPIDOGREL
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Generally good and interesting manuscript, well written with optimal subgroup matchup and proper and adequate study design and protocol, with deserved consideration practically in this form (with minor or major revisions) for publication.	
Minor REVISION comments	Firstly, abstract is too long (364 words, usually abstracts are limited to 300 words, so abstract should be shorten a bit) with 7 keywords (usually it should be 3-5 keywords). My opinion is that exclusion criteria should be better defined – what happened with patients with haematological disorders, febrile disorders and coagulopathies – did they participated in study or they were also excluded? Do You have data on bifurcation lesions subjects number and did these subjects had more complication rates? Do You have data for other pharmacological side effects (severe rash, diarrhoea, neutropenia etc.)? Some technical errors are presented in the text. References are not quoted properly (usually when there are 6 or more authors it should be quoted first three and written et al.). Tables, charts and figures are embedded in the text (usually tables, charts and figures are after the references). Also, usually in published papers there are much less supplementary materials (10 Figures, 6 Charts and 2 Tables are present in this paper), my opinion is that it would be a good idea to shorten a bit the number of supplementary material. Please also refer in study limitation section with general limitations regarding subject comorbidities and possible pharmacological interactions.	
Optional/General comments	Finally I would like to add that I find the quality of this work is generally good, one of the first comparing reduced dose prasugrel and clopidogrel in the Indian population and it should be considered for warrant publication with minor or major revision (upon Editor decision and Editor consultation if it could reach priority readership). Statistics seems to be appropriate.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dusan Petrovic
Department, University & Country	Serbia