Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CA_123611**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Successful coronary interventions with the ingenious Vector balloon in Chronic Total Occlusion (CTO)**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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.	This manuscript offers valuable insights into using the novel Vector® balloon for Chronic Total Occlusion (CTO) interventions, particularly in resource-limited settings. The promising preliminary results suggest it could be a cost-effective alternative to more expensive devices. However, the study's small sample size and single-center design indicate the need for larger trials to confirm these findings. Overall, it's an important contribution to advancing coronary intervention techniques.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Consider incorporating terms like "pilot study" or "preliminary results" in the title to reflect the study's small sample size and exploratory nature .	
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.	Yes! No modifications	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust due to its clear and well-structured methodology, including precise inclusion and exclusion criteria. The prospective study design is appropriate for evaluating the Vector® balloon's performance in real-world CTO interventions, and the detailed procedural descriptions ensure the findings are reproducible. Although the sample size is small, the careful analysis of safety and efficacy endpoints strengthens the validity of the study's conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	The discussion provides a good summary of the study's findings in the context of CTO interventions. To enhance it further, consider comparing the results with similar studies or established techniques to contextualize the Vector balloon's performance against existing technologies. Add recent references.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/General comments	1. Consider incorporating terms like "pilot study" or "preliminary results" to reflect the study's small sample size and exploratory nature. 2. The introduction provides a solid background on antegrade wiring (AW) and its common application in CTOs. However, briefly mentioning alternative strategies, such as retrograde approaches, could offer a more comprehensive context. This would also underscore the need for innovations like the Vector balloon. 3. The study's objective is clearly outlined, but linking the focus on the Vector balloon more explicitly to the challenges discussed earlier in the introduction would improve the transition from the problem statement to the study's objective. 4. While the follow-up period is noted, specifying its duration and detailing any specific metrics or outcomes tracked during this time would be beneficial. 5. Please include the name of the local ethical committee. 6. The discussion provides a good summary of the study's findings in the context of CTO interventions. To enhance it further, consider comparing the results with similar studies or established techniques to contextualize the Vector balloon's performance against existing technologies. 7. The discussion mentions the potential for the Vector balloon to replace more expensive devices, such as microcatheters, in resource-limited settings. Expanding on this point by exploring the economic and clinical implications of widespread adoption could add further value for readers. 8. The advantages of the Vector balloon, including its smaller profile and flexibility, are well-described. However, a more critical evaluation of any potential drawbacks or limitations would provide a more balanced perspective. 9. The discussion could be expanded to suggest specific areas for future research, such as comparative studies with other CTO devices or investigations into long-term patient outcomes with the Vector balloon. This would provide clear directions for future work and enhance the study's contribution to the field. Overall, the study presents valuable insights into the use of the Vector balloon in CTO interventions. Well presented study.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with the 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 detail)* No	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sarita Rao**
Department, University & Country	**Apollo Hospitals, India**