

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_98365
Title of the Manuscript:	The Relationship between Visible Thrombus Aspiration Material and No Reflow with Its Impact on In-Hospital Mortality and Early Outcomes in Patients with ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction Treated with Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Definitely yes No, it should be revised, because the title was too long and incoherent with the result of the study Abstract should be revised as well as the purpose, method, and conclusion Yes Yes Yes <p>Title Please revise Title was too long and incoherent with result section English grammar should be revised Do not use BOLD in table Vertical line in table should be deleted p-value is common, rather than p. value The aim of study should be one major, rather than several purposes. The author may add other result to support the major purpose of study The data presented was the differences (t test, chi square) between groups, no data about the correlation (bivariate analysis) or impact (regression analysis) . Purpose of study different)t from the result obviously differen (correlation and impact)The aim of study .Please revise (between groups</p> <p>Conclusion Please revise. This study was to compare between groups, but the result section was the effect of therapy. The therapy may lead to good prognosis, so the author should choose proper sentence Ethical clearance Please revise. Add registration number Permission Please clarify. Permission is much different from informed consent. Did the subject truly sign the informed consent Data analysis Please revise. The qualitative data was not refer to frequency nor percentage. This data was categorized as quantitative Please revise. Delete this sentence. No data presented in the manuscript about the distribution of data Please revise. Which table did the author use Monte carlo or Fisher exact or chi-square Please revise. No data presented with odd ratio Table Add abbreviation, also what is the meaning for “*” Normal font, not BOLD Vertical line should be removed Figure Change pattern bar to grey bar, prefer 2 dimension bar, not 3D Discussion Please revise. The discussion was confusing, because many paragraphs contained only 1 sentence without any correlation between paragraphs. The discussion about the study result, was limited. The table or figure should be refer in the text in the result and discussion section to accomodate audience understanding the study. When referring to reference, do not use ITALIC font or BOLD Matched Please revise. No matching sampling method was stated in the method section</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. English grammar should be revised	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Indrayadi Gunardi
Department, University & Country	Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia