

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_107163
Title of the Manuscript:	PHARMACO-INVASIVE THERAPY IS A CRITICAL OPTION IN NIGERIAN STEMI TREATMENT. A REVIEW
Type of the Article	overview

### 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, very important for the amplification of positive results in society care. It seems that it will be very useful for the care authorities activities</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of subsections and the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct at the level of an overview.</p> <p>6. The manuscript is scientifically correct at the level of an overview. In general, the list of references is sufficient, but to ameliorate the paper content it is proposed to consider the following publication: Implementation of Guidelines Improves the Standard of Care The Viennese Registry on Reperfusion Strategies in ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction (Vienna STEMI Registry), Karim Kalla et al,</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is of good quality.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The paper is worth of publication.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zdzislaw Trzaska</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Warsaw University of Technology, Poland</b>