

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. The title should be modified for greater clarity. 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Reference was sufficient, but must be updated. There was 15 articles (of 32 articles) dated more than 10 years.</p> <p>Title Please consider revising. This study examined the efficacy of MVPCI against CABG in patients with chronic kidney disease. The outcome should be stated. Suggestion: Comparison of the efficacy from multi-vessel disease percutaneous coronary intervention versus coronary artery bypass grafting in chronic kidney disease</p> <p>Ethical clearance Add the organization and registration number for the local ethics committee.</p> <p>Methods Add the organization and registration number for the local ethics committee.</p> <p>Table 1 and 2 Please revise. Add abbreviations to the table legend.</p> <p>Table 1 Please revise. The female gender must be specified as a study characteristic.</p> <p>Table 2 Please revise. Use "***" for significant P-value<0.05. The P-value score of 0.5 was not consider as statistically significant, although it was printed in bold font.</p> <p>Figure 1 Please revise. Choose only one of the following: table or figure. This figure is identical to table 2</p> <p>References Reference must be updated. There was 15 articles (of 32 articles) dated more than 10 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Indrayadi Gunardi
Department, University & Country	Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia