

Review Form

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_126460
Title of the Manuscript:	Outcomes of urgent coronary artery bypass graft surgery following non-ST elevation myocardial infarction
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>

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.	This article highlights the importance of CABG in GRACE 3 category NSREMI patients. GRACE 3 are usually deferred surgery in view of high risk. But this study shows better outcomes in these group of patients.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, Title is apt and suitable.	
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.	Grammatical errors are there, that needs to be corrected but no major flaws.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes Subsections and Structure of manuscript is ok.	
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.	This manuscript describes the relevance of CABG, in high risk GRACE 3 NSREMI patients, and the results would suggest that CABG is beneficial in those subsets of patients. Acceptable mortality is present in this study in these group of patients. This study would encourage more research in this aspect for more generalization.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is good, apart from few grammatical mistakes.	
Optional/General comments	Article can be accepted for publication.	

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:	Palanki Surya Satya Gopal
Department, University & Country	Nizam's Institute of Medical Sciences, India