

Review report

Final title: [Decoding the revolution of total arterial coronary artery bypass graft surgery](#)

Title at submission: Reviving Hearts: Decoding the Revolution of Total Arterial Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery

Submission date: 22-Sep-24

Revised submission: 8-Jan-25

Accepted: 15-Jan-25

Reviewer A: Montosh Kumar Mondal, ORCID: [0009-0009-8970-1674](#)

Overview

It is a new area highlighting a new surgical method, where the author highlights about new surgical procedure. However there are some minor issues need to be addressed to improve the quality of the manuscript.

1.

Comment

Response

Page 2 line 33 : regarding main body : better to write Introduction
We appreciate your concerns; however, this is the prescribed format for the BSMMUJ Commentary article, and there are no subsections, such as Introduction, Results, etc.
2.

Comment

Response

Introduction is very short, literature review seems to be incomplete, needs more elaboration and addition of more relevant paper is necessary.
Despite the word constraints, we further modified introductory statements, which were highlighted in yellow, lines 46-49.
3.

Comment

Response

Due to lack of Methodology and detailed description of surgical procedure is difficult to understand the readers about the importance of the study.
We understand your concerns; however, this is a commentary rather than an original article, which is why it lacks methodology and a detailed description of surgical procedures. However, lines 43-48 briefly describe total arterial CABG conduits and the procedure.
4.

Comment

Response

Line 60 : Downsides of saphenous vein grafts should go in introduction .
According to your suggestions, Line 60, "Downsides of saphenous vein grafts", moved to 2nd paragraph, lines 51-62.
5.

Comment

Response

Line 73 should go in recommendation
According to your suggestions, Line 73 was moved to the last paragraph, lines 101-103, as a recommendation.
6.

Comment

Response

Line 74 to 83 should go to discussion
Although the BSMMU J guidelines for commentary articles lack specific subsections like a discussion, we extrapolated paragraphs as the Background, Discussion and Conclusion subsection, and lines 74 to 83 belong to the discussion section, which aligns with your concerns. However, in-text citations are added to improve the clarity of the manuscript for lines 81,82 & 84-86.

Editor: M Mostafa Zaman, ORCID: [0000-0002-1736-1342](#)

1.	<div><div>Comment</div><div>Response</div></div>	<div>Replace the Highlights with Key messages. The key message should be a small paragraph not exceeding 60 words. This is due to the Journal's change in style.</div> <div>We appreciate your comments. We replaced the Highlights with Key messages and summarised them into a small paragraph comprising 50 words.</div>
2.	<div><div>Comment</div><div>Response</div></div>	<div>The storytelling (and the highlights) could not highlight the novelty of the methods. Adequate justification is missing to convince the review process why this method should be published and read by experts in the field. Revision of the texts is necessary.</div> <div>We appreciate your comments. Despite the word constraints, we further modified the manuscript to enhance the clarity and presentation, emphasising the significance of total arterial CABG surgery (Lines 28, 29, & 33; yellow highlighted).</div>