

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_129070
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Trimetazidine on the incidence of MACE in Asian patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Trimetazidine is piperazine derivatives which help with symptomatic treatment of stable angina pectoris. It is worthwhile to look at benefits of it. The manuscript addresses an important clinical question regarding the impact of trimetazidine on the incidence of Major Adverse Cardiac Events (MACE) in Asian patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI). Given the high burden of cardiovascular disease in Asia, this study offers valuable insights that could potentially influence treatment strategies for AMI patients in the region.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Recognize the type of study in the article. Very important. "Impact of Trimetazidine on Major Adverse Cardiac Events in Asian Patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction: A Systematic Review	Title revised
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.	The abstract should briefly explain the significance of the study. For example: "Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) is a leading cause of morbidity and mortality globally. Trimetazidine has been proposed as a potential adjunctive therapy to improve outcomes in AMI patients, but its efficacy in reducing Major Adverse Cardiovascular Events (MACE) remains debated, especially in Asian populations."	Ok revised
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript seems scientifically valid in its approach (a systematic review and meta-analysis), but it would benefit from more transparency in describing the methodology and statistical analysis. The authors should ensure that all key aspects of the review process—such as study selection, risk of bias, heterogeneity, and sensitivity analyses—are clearly described and appropriately addressed. Additionally, the results should be interpreted with a clear understanding of their limitations, especially when combining different types of studies (e.g., RCTs and observational studies).	Noted and revised
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Appropriate	Thanks
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript presents an interesting and important study, but to improve its clarity, scientific rigor, and readability, the authors should address the points raised above. After revising the manuscript based on these editorial comments, it would be appropriate for resubmission. The editorial team recommends the authors take the time to thoroughly revise the manuscript to meet the journal's standards for publication.	ok

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>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)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	