|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Journal Name: | **[Asian Journal of Cardiology Research](https://journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR)** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_AJCR\_138306** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Navigating Primary Coronary Angiography in Acute Myocardial Infarction with Dextrocardia: A Case Report on Diagnostic and Procedural Adaptations** |
| Type of the Article | **Case report** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
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| **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.** | This case report is helpful because it talks about a rare situation—doing emergency PCI in a patient with dextrocardia who’s having a heart attack. It gives useful tips on how to adjust the procedure for this unusual anatomy, which could help cardiologists facing similar cases. There’s not much written about this, so it adds something new to the field. |  |
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| 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 is good and covers the main points: the patient, the problem, and what was done. But it could mention a bit more about the challenges, like switching from radial to femoral access. Maybe add a line like: “The procedure was tricky, needing a switch to femoral access to engage the right coronary artery.” |  |
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **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)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* |  |

**Reviewer details:**

**Abhijeet Sharma , Swami Vivekanand Subharti University , India**