

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_125488
Title of the Manuscript:	Simple crossover stenting for the left main bifurcation lesions in patients with acute coronary syndrome – A case series
Type of the Article	Case report

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Although it is a known important subject on which researches continues and current reports are published. Unprotected left main bifurcation coronary lesions are challenging for interventionists because these lesions are associated with relatively poor outcomes after percutaneous coronary intervention. Several treatment strategies exist for LM bifurcation lesions like single stent technique, double stenting etc. but none of these has proven to be superior to the others. Controversies continuing about the topic.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Although the title of article is suitable for this manuscript, I suggest the title 'Simple crossover stenting RESULTS for the left main bifurcation lesions in patients with acute coronary syndrome – A case series'	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate for a case report.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>Unprotected left main bifurcation coronary lesions are challenging for interventionists because these lesions are associated with relatively poor outcomes after percutaneous coronary intervention. Several treatment strategies exists for LM bifurcation lesions like single stent technique, double stenting etc. but but none of these has proven to be superior to the others. Controversies continuing about the topic.</p> <p>Introduction part of case report is too long it should be shorten. better to mention shortly about controversies between simple crossover stenting without opening the side branch superior to SB opening and/or final kissing in patients with LM lesions. The Details should mentioned in discussion part. By this way discussion part enriched.</p> <p>In case series part part of manuscript patients procedures summarized in each case routinely but the follow up period did not mentioned. also these interventions have Procedural difficulties and may results with complications Authors should mention about the difficulties in discussion part and complications in case report part and the table of manuscript should be a part of case reports better to extract from discussion.</p> <p>All Figure legends are confusing. Coronary angiograms for cases 1 and 2 given but it was not stated that (a) and (b) belongs the first case and c /d belongs the second case. Also abbreviations are repeated in figure legends and this complicated legends. Better to revise reader friendly.</p> <p>The discussion section of the article should be enriched.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are sufficient and recent.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The authors declared that they have adhered to the ethical principles as directed under the Declaration of Helsinki. The authors declared that they have no conflicts of interests. Plagiarism is not suspected.	

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:	Baris Akca
Department, University & Country	Inonu University, Turkey