

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_86078
Title of the Manuscript:	A Contemporary Role of Beta Blockers in Myocardial Infarction
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Thank you for asking my opinion about the manuscript entitled "A Contemporary Role of Beta Blockers in Myocardial Infarction". I believe that this manuscript should be major revision:</p> <p>There were several good things about the paper, such as aim good. But the abstract should be reformulated and the objective of the study should be well highlighted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract should be completely changed. The abstract is untidy and needs to be paraphrased. Keywords are at least five words. The introduction is very short? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the introduction, include the significance of the study as well as novelty. What makes the study different from the rest and what does it add to the current knowledge? In the introduction, the authors should have explained the purpose of this study and the existing gaps in this field and explained why this study was conducted. References are relevant, correct, and not recent. The number of references should be increased. There are a lot of grammatical errors. This must be taken care of and addressed. <p>viewer's comment Is it possible to cite references from my papers in the research that I have reviewed?</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Ali B. Roomi
Department, University & Country	University of Thi-Qar, Al-Ayen University, Iraq