



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_20267
Title of the Manuscript:	Deferred Stenting as an alternative strategy for management of ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction with significant thrombus burden
Type of the Article	Short 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The study used a deferred stenting strategy following therapeutic treatment. It confirms previous finding in this field. Thus, this study is incremental.</p> <p>Major Critics: Number of patients is small to draw solid conclusion. There are no perfusion or DE-MRI data in this study. How did you confirm the reduction in no reflow (MVO) and infarct size? Please delete any speculation from the manuscript. How the reduction in no reflow zone reduces infarct size? Please clarify. It is true that MVO reduction improves LV function and prognosis.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maythem Saeed
Department, University & Country	University of San Francisco, California, USA