



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_47091
Title of the Manuscript:	Reasons of Non-guideline-concordant Treatment in Patients with Multivessel Coronary Artery Disease. REGRET-ONE TRIAL
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>1. Although I recognize the great utility, I also have critical thoughts regarding guidelines, "based evidence" and trials ...</p> <p>2. The present study is highly relevant but is poorly presented and at times it seems written unwillingly to write.</p> <p>3. I suggest a detailed review of the text and perhaps improve the presentation through graphics.</p>	Thank you for your great comments. We tried to do our best during conducting study and writing it. We already have 4 tables, unfortunately we do not have graphics.
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	