

Review Form 3

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 manuscript addresses a crucial gap in the management of high-risk NSTEMI patients by evaluating the outcomes of urgent CABG through GRACE score-based stratification. It is particularly valuable as it emphasizes the need for timely intervention, which could significantly impact patient survival in a vulnerable population. By focusing on risk stratification, this study provides practical insights that could refine clinical decision-making, helping clinicians prioritize care based on objective, evidence-based assessments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but suggestion Outcomes of Urgent Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting in High-Risk NSTEMI Patients: A GRACE Score-Based Analysis	
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.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	The use of GRACE score for risk stratification is well-supported by current guidelines, and its application here is appropriate for assessing mortality and risk in NSTEMI patients undergoing urgent CABG.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, needs to improve the language</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction: While the GRACE score is introduced well, a brief comparison to other risk assessment scores (e.g., TIMI, EuroSCORE) would enhance the background. A sentence on why GRACE was chosen over these alternatives for predicting in-hospital mortality in this population could add depth. Some terminology, such as "Scr" (likely referring to serum creatinine), should be fully defined for clarity. Consistently using abbreviations (e.g., ACS, MI) only after their first definition would enhance readability. The introduction would benefit from a more explicit hypothesis or research question to give the reader a clear understanding of what the study aims to prove or explore, such as the role of GRACE-based risk stratification in improving CABG outcomes for NSTEMI patients.</p> <p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity on Study Design: Explicitly mention if this study is retrospective, prospective, or a mix (if applicable). The current text hints at a retrospective approach but would benefit from a clearer statement. • Data Source: While it's noted that data were collected prospectively in a database, you may also clarify if the database was part of a larger study or registry. • Explanation of GRACE: If your audience includes readers who may not be familiar with GRACE, consider briefly describing its purpose in evaluating mortality risk in acute coronary syndrome (ACS) patients. • Please rephrase some sentences - eg. All CABG procedures were performed within 30 days of the index hospital admission, following at least 24 hours post-admission." <p>Results</p> <p>Kindly write the results text for better readability. briefly interpret clinical implications of the findings, such as how these may influence patient stratification or management in similar settings.</p> <p>Ejection Fraction (EF): "Group 3 had the lowest EF, indicating greater ventricular dysfunction, which could correlate with higher mortality risk (p=0.026)."</p> <p>"EuroSCORE was significantly low among group 3" could be confusing, as EuroSCORE is generally higher in higher-risk groups. If EuroSCORE indeed was lower, clarify if this finding contradicts expectations and provide potential explanations.</p> <p>Since longer cross-clamp times can impact post-operative outcomes, briefly note any potential implications for patient recovery.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Organize the discussion into distinct paragraphs that address specific aspects of your findings, such as the implications of urgent CABG, the role of the GRACE score, differences in outcomes across risk groups, and study limitations. This would make each section more cohesive and easier to follow.</p> <p>When discussing the association between urgent CABG and improved outcomes, briefly restate how these findings could impact clinical practice.</p> <p>You noted a higher mortality in Group 3 without significant differences in complication rates across groups. This is an important finding, and discussing potential reasons for this discrepancy could be valuable.</p> <p>There are some grammatical and structural issues that could be clarified.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sarita Rao</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Apollo Hospitals, Indore, India</p>