

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_128972
Title of the Manuscript:	Decoding In-Stent Restenosis: A Single Center Experience
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The in-stent restenosis is technically challenging task for cardiovascular surgeons, interventional cardiologists or endovascular surgeons. To understand the mechanical damage to the intima and media is very important. The frequency of surgical treatment of coronary heart disease has increased significantly in recent years. This manuscript is really excellent.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	
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 author should use full words for abbreviations in abstract. In methodology: PCI. Write full form of PCI – Percutaneous coronary intervention. Then you can use short form in brackets (PCI). Same with - MACCE, STEMI, NSTEMI, BMS, DES, DEB.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, its scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author should add more recent references regarding drug eluting stents and drug eluting ballons in in-stent restenosis. (if available and possible)	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of English language is suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors should add angiographic figures (pictures/images) of DES, DEB, Stent under expansion, Neo-intimal hyperplasia, Neoatherosclerosis (if available). It will make the manuscript more understandable, original and scientifically proved. There are no ethical issues.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kuchay Arshed Ahmad
Department, University & Country	Limb Salvage Center, Russia