

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_123385
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Different Revascularization Strategies Implemented in Acute Myocardial Infarction on the Recovery of Left Ventricular Functional and Deformational Parameters
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Interesting, informative, implementable knowledge Appropriate and Scientifically informative and interesting	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive and informative	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Correct the spelling mistakes and requires typographical corrections	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Subsections and structure is appropriate Review of literature is required Discussion is in detail Sentences are appropriate Discussion is adequate	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are in proper order Add recent references	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammatical correction to be done	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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:	Sharan Badiger
Department, University & Country	BLDE (Deemed to be University), India