

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_126230
Title of the Manuscript:	A PROSPECTIVE OBSERVATIONAL STUDY ON ASSESSMENT OF CLINICAL PROFILE OF PATIENTS WITH MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION IN A TERTIARY CARE TEACHING HOSPITAL
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Myocardial Infarction is a leading disease in the current century,the importance of clinical profile evaluates the vitals of the case and cause for the development of disease and further therapy	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, title of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes,Its appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The novelty of carrying out this research and its publication defines its robust	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	I Suggest to include more references from recent literatures	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, English language is suitable for scholarly communications	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K Karthick
Department, University & Country	The Tamilnadu Dr MGR Medical University, India