

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_111606
Title of the Manuscript:	Early Results of Endoscopic versus Open Saphenous Vein Harvesting in Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting: A Single Blinded Randomized Controlled Trial
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Relevant topic- Studies on newer less invasive alternatives to traditional surgical techniques need to be published to reach the scientific community. This study also compares the post operative quality of life between both techniques, which is also important.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes- Methodology section can be written in a better way, if time permits</p> <p>Yes- clarification needed on when the outcomes were measured? It says 'during 30 postoperative days' in methodology. But that includes post op day 0- day 30.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Tables need to mention which values are given as mean +/- SD, and which values are number (%). Text inside cells in tables need to be concise, not sentences with examples. Also QoL domain headings in Table 4 need to be in bold</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Grammar needs to be corrected in multiple places. Also, the manuscript needs to be written in past tense- in several places highlighted in reviewers copy, it has been given as in future tense.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, good effort from authors.. The manuscript needs minor corrections in tense and sentence construction in some places-</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Priya Ravindra Panicker
Department, University & Country	Sree Mookamika Institute of Medical Sciences, India