

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research .
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ JAMMR_84469
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Percutaneous Coronary Intervention with Everolimus-Eluting Versus Sirolimus-Eluting Stents in Diabetic Patients presented with Acute Coronary Syndromes: A short-term comparative clinical outcome study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The study falls short of its main objective on many levels. The following are the compulsory changes/clarifications that need to be done before the manuscript can be reconsidered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The title and objectives of the study are misleading since acute coronary syndrome includes STEMI. The study objectives and titles should use NSTEMI-ACS instead of ACS.</li> <li>2) Out dated references regarding Sirolimus Eluting stents (references are greater than 15 years old). Newer generation SES stents are available and widely used</li> <li>3) Misleading and wrong references regarding EES being the thinnest struts. The thinnest struts currently available are Orsiro and Corflex ISAR which are both Sirolimus eluting stents</li> <li>4) The authors claim that to the "best of their knowledge" there is no head to head comparative data between the two types of stents. However they have themselves given reference of ESSENCE-DIABETES trial which was a head to head comparison between the two stents. The authors fail to provide a rationale for their study.</li> <li>5) When were the patient divided/randomised into two groups? At the time of diagnosis/admission, after PCI or at discharge?</li> <li>6) How and when were the patients randomised?</li> <li>7) How were the patients followed up?</li> <li>8) What were the diagnostic criteria for Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus?</li> <li>9) Which generation of Sirolimus stents were used? Please mention in methods section</li> <li>10) The method section is not very clear about how patients were selected and randomised (It has contradicting statements)</li> <li>11) Did patients that received multiple stents had the same group of stents deployed or had crossovers?</li> <li>12) Statistical analysis section does not mention how the results of both the groups were compared , what tests were used?</li> <li>13) MACE is not well defined</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	1) Numerous grammatical and spelling errors that need to be corrected	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall this manuscript seems to be a half-hearted and hasty attempt in writing a study that can potentially be a good addition to literature on the drug eluting stents topic.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Syed Waqar Ahmed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Aga Khan University Hospital, Pakistan</b>