

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_100141
Title of the Manuscript:	CORONARO CAMERAL FISTULA : LITERATURE REVIEW, DIAGNOSIS AND MANAGEMENT, ABOUT A CASE
Type of the Article	Case study

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)	It is more than important: this disclosure is utterly compulsory for scientific progress! Sure, this is Sure, even if I would like to affirm that the abstract would seem a copy and paste of the Introduction, but as Latins used to declare: repetita juvant Sure, they are Never found before an article that did not necessitate corrections (only two slight "grammatical vagaries" I have added Certainly! Any additional comment is to be provided, according to my modest judgement	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	British employed from AA is exceptional even scholarly	
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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lorenzo Martini
Department, University & Country	University of Siena, Italy