

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_100905
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological Analysis of Patients Undergoing Left Main Coronary Angioplasty.
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.journalijrc.com/index.php/AJRCD/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, it is definitely important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights and contributes in decision making to the field of study.</li> <li>2. The title of the article is suitable and accurately represents the content of the manuscript.</li> <li>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the findings.</li> <li>4. Yes, Both are appropriate, facilitating logical flow and readability.</li> <li>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the information presented.</li> <li>6. The references provided are sufficient and reasonably recent.</li> </ol> <p><b>Additional suggestions/comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure clarity and elaboration in certain sections.</li> <li>• Address potential limitations and provide a well-supported conclusion.</li> <li>• Consider suggestions for future research directions or improvements.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	YES	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract provides a clear overview of the study, including the objectives, methodology, and key findings. It effectively summarizes the main points of the research.</li> <li>2. The introduction provides relevant background information on the left main coronary artery and the prevalence of Diseases in this artery. It also references guidelines and previous studies to establish the importance of myocardial revascularization and percutaneous intervention for left main coronary artery disease.</li> <li>3. The methodology section adequately describes the study design, data collection process, and statistical analysis methods used. However, it would be better to provide more details on the inclusion and exclusion criteria for patient selection.</li> <li>4. Results and discussion are appreciate and presents the key findings of the study in a clear and organized manner. The tables and figures provide a visual representation of the data.</li> <li>5. According to study there is high Syntax Score associated with a higher risk of complications, which is consistent with previous studies.</li> <li>6. The discussion section compares the study's findings with previous research and highlights similarities and differences. especially the EXCEL and NOBLE studies, which provide additional context to the findings.</li> <li>7. The limitations of the study are not explicitly discussed. It would be beneficial to acknowledge any potential limitations in data collection, patient selection, or other factors that may have influenced the results.</li> <li>8. The conclusion provides a concise summary of the study's emphasizing the safety and success rates of percutaneous intervention in the left main coronary artery.</li> <li>9. The keywords should be included at the end of the abstract helps in identifying the main focus of the study.</li> </ol> <p><b>Overall, the article presents a valuable analysis of patients undergoing left main coronary angioplasty. The study contributes to the existing literature and provides insights into the clinical-epidemiological profile of these patients. However, addressing the limitations and</b></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p><b>providing more details on the patient selection process would further strengthen the study.</b></p> <p>The research article provides valuable insights into patients undergoing left main coronary angioplasty. It analyzes patient characteristics, outcomes, and complications. However, it could benefit from improvements in methodology, results interpretation and addressing limitations. Nonetheless, the study contributes to the existing knowledge on the topic.</p>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Khalida Soomro</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ziauddin University Hospital, Pakistan</b>