

Editor-in-Chief  
World Journal of Cardiology  
10<sup>th</sup> December 2019

Dear Sir,

We are respectfully submitting revisions of the manuscript titled “**Comparative Assessment of Clinical Profile and Outcomes after Primary Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Young Patients with Single versus Multivessel Disease**” [Manuscript NO: 52351] for publication consideration in *World Journal of Cardiology*. We appreciate the insightful editorial and reviewer comments, all of which have been specifically addressed in this revised version of the manuscript. Please find below the reviewer comments and the author responses. We believe these changes have strengthened the quality of our manuscript and that you will find it suitable for publication in the Journal.

Thank you for your consideration, and we hope that you find our revised manuscript suitable for publication in Journal of the World Journal of Cardiology.

Thank you,

**Yours sincerely,**

Dr. Atif Sher Muhammad, FCPS

Senior Registrar at National Institute of Cardiovascular Diseases (NICVD), Rafiqui (H.J.)

Shaheed Road, Karachi- 75510, Pakistan.

E.mail: dratifsher89@gmail.com

Cell no: +923008962761

## Reviewer Comments

A few comments to be addressed during revision:

**Comment:** 1) Please specify the definition of coronary artery lesions used in the study for the lesion being accounted for multivessel CAD?

**Response:** As per the suggestion, material and methods section is updated

**Comment:** 2) Table 1 showed that nearly half of the STEMI patients (47.6% in general) in this particularly young group had “No symptoms, no angina” at presentation. This is unusual. Please explain.

**Response:** As per the suggestion, material and methods and result section (Table 1) are updated. As per the NCDR the CCS classification indicate the patient’s anginal classification or symptom status within the past 2 weeks from presentation.

**Comment:** 3) It might be a good idea to pre-specify a composite outcome for analysis, i.e. MACE, to re-analyze the data to see whether there is any statistical difference in outcome between these two groups.

**Response:** As per the suggestion, data are provided in Table 3

**Comment:** 4) Were all the STEMI culprit lesions treated with stenting? How many stents were used for each group of patients (in average)?

**Response:** As per the suggestion, data are provided in Table 3 and material and methods section

**Comment:** 5) The manuscript cited an increased contrast used in MVD patients. The authors should provide their data on this topic.

**Response:** As per the suggestion, data are provided in Table 3

**Comment:** 6) CIRC and LCX were both used in the manuscript for circumflex. Please choose one

**Response:** As per the suggestion, instances of CIRC were updated with LCX

**Comment:** 7) Please used the official term of “CathPCI Registry®”

**Response:** Updated as per suggestion