

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CA_116218</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of posterior pericardiotomy on prevention of post operative atrial fibrillation in patients undergoing coronary bypass surgery.</b>
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, the manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community, as it investigates a surgical technique (posterior pericardiotomy) and its potential impact on reducing postoperative complications, particularly atrial fibrillation, in patients undergoing coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) surgery. Postoperative atrial fibrillation is a common complication after cardiac surgery and is associated with increased morbidity and mortality. Therefore, studies exploring preventive strategies are valuable for improving patient outcomes and guiding clinical practice.</li> <li>2. The title "Impact of posterior pericardiotomy on prevention of postoperative atrial fibrillation in patients undergoing coronary bypass surgery" is suitable, as it clearly conveys the primary focus and objective of the study.</li> <li>3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, including the purpose, methods, results, and conclusions. However, the abstract could benefit from a more concise and focused introduction, highlighting the clinical significance and rationale for the study.</li> <li>4. The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and follow a logical flow, covering the essential components of a research paper, including the introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion.</li> <li>5. From a scientific standpoint, the manuscript appears to be generally correct and well-constructed. However, there are a few areas where improvements or additional clarifications could be helpful:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. In the materials and methods section, consider providing more details on the randomization process, blinding (if any), and the specific surgical techniques employed in the pericardiotomy, and control groups.</li> <li>b. The discussion section could be strengthened by providing a more detailed comparison with previous literature, addressing potential limitations of the study, and discussing the clinical implications and future research directions more thoroughly.</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</li> <li>7. Additional suggestions/comments:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The introduction section could be expanded to provide a more comprehensive background on the clinical significance and burden of postoperative atrial fibrillation, as well as the potential mechanisms underlying its development after CABG surgery.</li> <li>b. The conclusion section could be more concise and focused, summarizing the main findings and their implications for clinical practice and future research.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes, the language is of sufficient quality.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Savvas Lampridis</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Imperial College London, UK</b>