

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research .
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ JAMMR_84469
Title of the Manuscript:	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
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.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Introduction, third paragraph is discontinued and not properly ended, authors' needs to rewrite it. 2. <u>Authors must include the Informed consent as well as IEC/ IRB approval details in the methods section of the manuscript.</u> 3. Why not male Vs. female gender based outcomes comparison was not performed in both EES and SES group of patients in 6 months follow up. 4. Why not late stent problems such as stent thrombosis and stent restenosis were not studied in both EES and SES group of patients in 6 months follow up. 5. Use same font style (avoid using bold, italics) in the last paragraph of the results section. 6. Discussion part seems to be large, at the same time why there is no enough comparison with your study? It needs relook. 7. There are some typographical and spelling mistakes, I have corrected using comments section in the manuscript, and authors need to correct the same as mentioned before submission. 8. There are some suggestions and questions from my side in the comments section, authors need to go through it and follow-up the same. 9. Authors should follow the journal recommended reference citation style as per journal guidelines. 10. References seems to be not editable, some references are not clear for example reference number 7 (2019;13:1753944719826335-.?) 11. Authors should use more recent references because only 8 references are from past 10 years (2011 to 2021) among 28 references. (Author needs to check out the comments section in the manuscript file for my corrections, suggestions and other questions) 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. In Introduction, authors need to point out the previous study report why Limus-eluting stents are not superior to paclitaxel-eluting stents in treating diabetic patients. 13. Patient's Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study may be incorporated in the methods section rather than in limitations of the study. 14. In the Conclusion part, authors need to mention the country of the study population where both EES and SES are comparable to each other regarding the treatment of acute coronary syndrome in diabetic patients. 	
Optional/General 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vinoth Prabhu Veeramani
Department, University & Country	University of Tabuk, Saudi Arabia