Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Volume 23 · Issue 7 · e119477

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Comparing the Effect of a Preprocedural Loading Dose of Atorvastatin vs. Rosuvastatin on the Prevalence of No-reflow and Low TIMI Flow in Patients with ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction Undergoing Primary Percutaneous Intervention

Naser Aslanabadi, Naser Khalili, Reza Hajizadeh, Dorsa Kavandi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
25 Sep 2021	2 Jan 2022	2 Feb 2022	10.5812/semj-119477

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 Associate Editor 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

1 comment · 27 Oct 2021

Associate Editor

REJECT 27 Oct 2021

The topic of the study is interesting, but the study design is faulty.
There are many important factors in the no-reflow phenomenon after primary PCI, such as total ischemic time, initial EF, the technique used for PCI, etc., and none of them were considered in the study, so the difference between the two groups cannot be accounted for by the use of medications alone.

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 professor

We completed revising our manuscript and changes was done as below:

Reviewer 1:

Were the drugs used by the patients the same or not? Thanks for your comment. They were the same. It was added to methods part

Was the stent type the same for both groups? Yes, Supraflex stent used for all patients. It was added to methods section

Reviewer 2:

In the present study the authors have checked to see whether rosuvastation compared to atrovastation would reduce rate of no reflow in patients undergoing PCI.
It is unclear why the authors have declared that their study is a case-control one. This study is definitely a clinical trial and the authirs themselves have provided IRCT code for it.
The manuscript should be corrected as a clinical trial following CONSORT reporting formats. Thanks a lot for this valuable comment. It was done. CONSORT reporting format used in the beginning of results part

Associate Editor 1:
The topic of the study is interesting but the study design is faulty
There are many important factors for no-reflow phenomenon after primary PCI like total ischemic time, initial EF, technique used for PCI etc and none of them were considered in the study, so the difference in the two groups cannot be accounted for by the use of medications only.

Thanks for this valuable comment. It was described by detail in methods and results sections and highlighted with green.

Associate Editor 2:
As the authors can see the manuscript should undergo meticulous revision and the revised form should be reviewed again. Thanks, it was done

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.