

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> 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: 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> <p>1. The abstract should be completely changed. The abstract is untidy and needs to be paraphrased. Keywords are at least five words.</p> <p>2. The introduction is very short?</p> <p>2.1. 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?</p> <p>2.1. 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.</p> <p>3. References are relevant, correct, and not recent. The number of references should be increased.</p> <p>4. There are a lot of grammatical errors. This must be taken care of and addressed.</p> <p>viewer's comment</p> <p>Is it possible to cite references from my papers in the research that I have reviewed?</p>	<p>1. As per the valuable suggestion abstract is reformulated and paraphrased. And a new keyword is added</p> <p>2.1 Several new statements are added in the Introduction with new reference</p> <p>2.2. Purpose of this study and the existing gaps in this field are added.</p> <p>3. References are added.</p> <p>4. grammatical errors are resolved.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No