

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_120698</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Effectiveness of Different Antiplatelet Regimens in Patients with Acute Coronary Syndrome: A Systematic Review</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes interesting article and important for scientific community. It effectively communicates the study's focus on comparing various antiplatelet treatments for acute coronary syndrome (ACS) through a systematic review. However, few revisions are necessary before publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes title of the article is suitable and clear	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest 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 subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons: <b>Comprehensive Methodology:</b> The review follows the PRISMA guidelines, ensuring a systematic and transparent approach to data collection and analysis. <b>Extensive Data Collection:</b> It includes studies from the past 10 years, sourced from reputable databases like Google Scholar and PUBMED. <b>Balanced Analysis:</b> The manuscript discusses both traditional and novel antiplatelet agents, highlighting their benefits and limitations.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	References are sufficient but it is better to add DOI Numbers also.	
Minor REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Requires improvement in English. Article is having several grammar mistakes and incomplete sentences. Authors need to revise carefully and prefer some English editing services	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Material method part is very short and having incorrect information about final articles included in study and numbers of extracted and excluded articles.</li> <li>2. grammar check &amp; reframing of sentences required in points highlighted or added comments in reviewed article file.like correction in very first line in abstract.</li> <li>3. Author can add important key words.</li> <li>4. Author need to add DOI Numbers in relevant references in the manuscript.</li> <li>5. The language of the article needs to be improved substantially by professional editing services</li> <li>6. Article can be published after minor correction and revision.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Ansari Imtiyaz Ejaz</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>R. C. Patel Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research, India</b>