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Reviewer's report:

Dear Author,

First of all, I'm sorry to be late because I've been busy for the last 2 weeks. Manuscript number:BCAR-D-17-00022R1 and entitled "Antithrombotic treatment during coronary angioplasty after failed thrombolysis: strategies and prognostic implications. Results of the RESPIRE registry." I've read the article and evaluated. I congratulate the authors for this research. I think your study has remarkable results.

1. The 'RESPIRE' study in the "'Antithrombotic treatment during coronary angioplasty after failed thrombolysis: strategies and prognostic implications. Results of the RESPIRE registry." statement in the title of the worker is not mentioned in the article.

2. "In the MERLIN study, one-month mortality in the RA arm was 9.8%, and anterior infarction was the only predictor of mortality.6 The mortality rate in these studies is comparable to the rate found in our study, and anterior infarction and age were- likewise predictive factors for mortality. Cardiogenic shock was not, because this was an exclusion criterion in these studies." In the MERLIN study, patients with cardiogenic shock were not included in the study. However, in your studies, cardiogenic shock patients were included in the study. Hence mortality rates will be different. This should be noted in the "Limitations section".

I think this might be an interesting article type paper. This is a clinically important issue that is in the cardiology field. Text can be accepted after the corrections are made.
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