

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_97321
Title of the Manuscript:	Outcome of Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery with Low Preoperative Ejection Fraction
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Yes, patient with low LVEF have higher risk while undergoing CABG but current data is scarce, so it is clinically relevant research question</b>  <b>No, it should say "Comparison of outcomes of CABG in patients with LVEF &lt;40% vs &gt;40%."</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>Yes</b> <b>No, it is unclear why cut off of 40% was chosen, low LVEF for peri-operative risk is generally considered &lt;30% and using 40% cut off does not provide the correct picture of data. Alternatively, authors should provide comparison of patients in multiple groups such as LVEF &gt;40% vs 30-40% vs &lt;30%</b> <b>Poorly written manuscript with multiple unclear sentences and spelling mistakes. Authors can provide one table comparing baseline characteristics of study population and stratify the population in multiple groups as mentioned above.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No, needs multiple corrections as outlines in the attached word document with comments.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mukesh Singh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Illinois College of Medicine at Rockford, United States</b>