

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Cardiology Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJCR_102286</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Chronic total occlusion of coronary left main artery supplied by right collaterals under vascular endothelial growth factor inhibitor therapy : a rare case report</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

### 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.journalajcr.com/index.php/AJCR/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, it is crucial for researchers to provide information for further research activities.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, It is moderately suitable, even if it needs major correction.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes, it is moderately articulated, even if it needs minor correction.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes, it is poor and needs major modification and correction.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, it is moderately accepted, but it needs major modification and correction particularly In the methodology and analysis sections.</b></p> <p>6. <b>Yes, it is sufficient but needs to be revisited by including recent empirical results.</b></p> <p><b>Memo: Please look at the comments seriously so that the researcher will revisit the paper in line with the comments to maintain the credibility of the journal.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>It is suitable, even if it needs a major correction.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>It is essential to revisit the introduction, methodology, analysis methods, and referencing section.</b></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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yenehun Taye Engida</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia</b>