

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_95236
Title of the Manuscript:	Short term outcome of Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Anaemic Patients Presenting with Coronary Artery Diseases
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript offers novel insight into the β- carotene in STZ- induced diabetic rats 2. The title is well presented. 3. The abstract is well written. 4. The subsection and structure were well written 5. The manuscript was written well 6. The references are okay. However, there is need for uniformity and the authors should follow the guidelines for the references The work requires language editing to enhance its quality Having the weight of the rats before and after treatment would be encouraged to be added	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Its fair, however, needs to be edited	
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:	Rotimi Damilare
Department, University & Country	Landmark University, Nigeria