

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_101475
Title of the Manuscript:	AN EMERGENCY MEDICINE REVIEW OF THE MECHANICAL, INFLAMMATORY, AND EMBOLIC COMPLICATIONS OF MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION
Type of the 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>)

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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript deals with the important area like Myocardial Infarction. So, Yes the manuscript is important for scientific community 2. Yes, the title of the article seems to be suitable 3. No, the abstract of the article is not comprehensive. The author has to follow guideline. 4. No, the sub section and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate. 5. No, the manuscript is not scientifically correct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Author has to follow guideline for font and font size - Introduction part is too little for and review article - In majority of statement, the author has not provided citation number. - There is mismatch in claimed literature source number (177) with that reference number provided by the author (130). - The narrative part for review article has been missing. 6. Author has only given the reference number up to 130 but the citation number (175) and the claimed literature source is 177. <p>Note: Additional comment has been given in manuscript section. Please find the additional comment.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>No the language/English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communications. The article should be revised in a thorough manner.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saibijaya Rijal
Department, University & Country	Manmohan Technical University, Nepal