International Cardiovascular Research Journal
Volume 18 · Issue 1 · e145312
OPEN PEER REVIEW

Comparing One-Year Survival in Anterior Versus Inferior ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction Patients: Results of a Cohort Study in Western Iran

Parisa Janjani, Farzaneh Godarzi, Nahid Salehi, Atiyeh Asadmobini

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
19 May 2024	6 Aug 2024	18 Aug 2024	10.5812/icrj-145312

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

3 comments · 31 May 2024 – 29 Jul 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 31 May 2024

Hi,

I am uploading the review of the article titled " Comparing One-year Survival in Anterior Versus Inferior ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction Patients: Results of a cohort study in western Iran ".

Best,

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 24 Jul 2024

dear author,
Your manuscript has now been assessed.
While we appreciate your submission, the reviewers have expressed their concerns about the statistical analysis, methodology and limitations of the study. We kindly request that you address all suggested corrections, including the addition of the study's strength, in the revised manuscript to improve its overall quality.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 29 Jul 2024

Please make the necessary changes and resubmit the manuscript.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear editor of the International cardiovascular Research Journal

We are very excited to have been given the opportunity to revise our manuscript, which entitle, “Comparing One-year Survival in Anterior Versus Inferior ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction Patients: Results of a cohort study in western Iran” for the International cardiovascular Research Journal. We carefully considered your comments as well as those offered by the reviewers. Herein, we explain how we revised the paper based on those comments and recommendations.

We hope that these revisions improve the paper such that you and the reviewers now deem it worthy of publication in the International cardiovascular Research Journal.

Best regards

Reviewer 1:

Hi,

I am uploading the review of article titled " Comparing One-year Survival in Anterior Versus Inferior ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction Patients: Results of a cohort study in western Iran ".

Best,

Thank you for your time to review our manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

sampling method and inclusion criteria was not appropriate and risk factors that can be effective in result, such as previous history of MI, CABG, CVA, DM and sampling method and inclusion criteria was not appropriate and risk factors that can be effective in result, such as previous history of MI, CABG, CVA, DM, not adequately described …..,not adequately described

Thank you for your valuable feedback. I appreciate your comments regarding the sampling method, inclusion criteria, and the description of risk factors.

Sampling Method and Inclusion Criteria: Our study enrolled all individuals with acute STEMI who underwent PPCI within 12 hours at Imam Ali Hospital during the specified period. This approach was aimed at capturing a representative cohort of patients who received timely intervention. However, I understand that there might be concerns about the inclusion criteria. Our exclusion of patients hospitalized for more than 24 hours before transfer was intended to ensure that we focused on those with acute presentations, which we believe is crucial for understanding early intervention outcomes. We acknowledge that more detailed descriptions of the rationale behind this criterion and its potential impact on the results could be beneficial.

We appreciate your concern regarding the adequacy of describing risk factors such as previous myocardial infarction (MI), coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG), cerebrovascular accident (CVA), and diabetes mellitus (DM) in our study.

We would like to clarify the following points to address your concerns:

> In our study, we carefully documented and included a range of cardiovascular risk factors, including previous MI, CABG, CVA, and DM. These factors were gathered through physician-validated self-reports and medical records, ensuring that the data was both accurate and comprehensive.
>
> Our statistical analysis included these risk factors in the Cox proportional hazard regression models. Specifically, we adjusted for these variables in Model 2, which controlled for the effects of age, gender, BMI, diabetes, GFR, LDL-cholesterol, HDL-cholesterol, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, heart rate, systolic blood pressure, LVEF, smoking, previous CABG, previous PCI, previous MI, and type of reperfusion therapy. This thorough adjustment allows us to accurately assess the independent effect of STEMI type on all-cause mortality while accounting for these critical risk factors.
>
> While we acknowledge that there were some missing values for certain covariates, the proportion of missing data was relatively small. We performed our analyses on complete case data, which we believe sufficiently mitigates the impact of missing values. Our approach aligns with standard practices in epidemiological research and ensures robust and reliable findings.
>
> We adhered to the STROBE guidelines, which are designed to ensure comprehensive and transparent reporting of observational studies. This adherence underscores our commitment to high-quality research practices and to providing a detailed and accurate account of our study methods and findings.

In conclusion, we have taken considerable measures to ensure that key risk factors are adequately described and incorporated into our analyses. We hope this response addresses your concerns and reinforces the validity of our study's findings. Thank you once again for your valuable feedback.

Reviewer 3:

Abstract

Method

Add the sample size

Add the software

Thank you for your valuable comment. We add sample size and software in the abstract and method sections.

Results:

Please correct the "totaling 598, 4109 person-days" to " totaling 598 patients, 4109 person-days"

When you have person days, the incidence rate should be defined accordingly.

Thank you for your valuable comment we corrected it.

Main body:

Specify the exact type of study. In the written method of descriptive study, if your study is an analytical study.

Your comment is correct. Our study goes beyond mere description by employing advanced statistical methods to analyze relationships and adjust for confounding variables, classifying it as an analytical study.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

dear author,

Your manuscript, has now been assessed.

While we appreciate your submission, the reviewers have expressed their concerns about the statistical analysis, methodology and limitations of the study. We kindly request that you address all suggested corrections including addition of the study's strength in the revised manuscript for an improved overall quality.

Dear Associate Editor

Thank you for your time and comment. We added a new strength in one paragraph in the manuscript.

EIC Decision:

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 18 Aug 2024

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 18 Aug 2024

accept