

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_95931
Title of the Manuscript:	Multi-vessel disease percutaneous coronary intervention versus coronary artery bypass grafting in patients with chronic kidney disease.
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.journalca.com/index.php/CA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Thank you for asking my opinion about the manuscript entitled "Multi-vessel disease percutaneous coronary intervention versus coronary artery bypass grafting in patients with chronic kidney disease.". I believe that this manuscript should be major revision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the introduction, include the study's significance and novelty. What makes the study different from the rest and what does it add to the current knowledge?. 2. In the introduction, the authors should have explained the purpose of this study and the existing gaps in this field and explained why this study was conducted. 3. References are relevant, correct, and not recent. The number of references should be increased. please add some references. since this is a scientific review, all the sentences need to be supported with references. <p>This study is very beautiful. I liked the sequence and enjoyed reading it. Please add more references to similar studies.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. There are a lot of grammatical errors. This must be taken care of and addressed. 5. What are the limitations of the study? A description of limitations is missing at the end of the discussion section. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali B. Roomi
Department, University & Country	National University of Science and Technology, Iraq