

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This manuscript examines an important clinical question regarding the optimal technique for saphenous vein harvesting during coronary artery bypass grafting. The study is well-designed and provides useful evidence that endoscopic vein harvesting results in better early postoperative outcomes compared to open vein harvesting. This will be of interest to the cardiac surgery community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract provides a nice overview of the key aspects of the study design, results, and conclusions.</p> <p>4. Yes, the manuscript structure follows the standard format for a clinical trial report. The sections are logically organized and cover all necessary details about the study methods, results, and discussion.</p> <p>5. The statistical analysis appears appropriately done. The results support the conclusions that endoscopic vein harvesting is associated with reduced leg wound complications, less postoperative pain, and better quality of life compared to open harvesting. The data seem scientifically valid.</p> <p>6. The references are reasonably current and include important citations related to saphenous vein harvesting techniques as well as clinical trial design and statistics. No additional key references appear to be missing.</p> <p>In summary, this is a well-executed randomized trial that will make a meaningful contribution to the literature on optimal approaches for saphenous vein harvesting in coronary artery bypass grafting surgery. The manuscript is written clearly and follows proper reporting guidelines. I recommend this paper for publication after some minor revisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add 2-3 sentences in the Discussion further commenting on the generalizability of the results beyond the specific patient population studied. - There are a few minor typos to correct. - Make sure numerical values in text match data in the tables. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of this manuscript are suitable for scholarly publication. The sentence structure and terminology used follow proper scientific conventions for reporting a clinical trial in the medical literature. There is some minor awkward phrasing in a few spots, but nothing that impacts comprehension or requires major editing. A quick proofread to correct minor grammatical or wording issues would further polish the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Savvas Lampridis
Department, University & Country	Hammersmith Hospital, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, UK