



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_61865
Title of the Manuscript:	Marker wire technique for precise LAD ostium stenting
Type of the Article	Case study

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. I think statements like "Our case shows that with simple marker wire technique precise LAD ostium stenting can be done with good results as compared to with imaging techniques like IVUS and OCT" under abstract and "LAD ostial stenting can performed with good outcomes even without costly modalities like IVUS and OCT" under conclusion, can only be made when you have performed IVUS or OCT to demonstrate the ostial coverage of the stent or when you have a study with a comparator arm where you demonstrate with IVUS or OCT and compare with study arm. Otherwise I think we should refrain from making such statements with single care report.</p> <p>2. The statement under procedure "The idea was that with blood flow the portion of wire will stuck with the roof of carina, which acts as marker of ostium." It is a good observation but do you have any objective evidence or previous studies to support your claim that antegrade blood flow will make the wire to stuck to the roof of carina? And there are other factors with determine the position of wire in the vessel such as the angle of origin of the wired side branch, disease in the ostium of wired side branch etc.</p> <p>3. How do you justify treating non culprit lesion in the setting of STEMI when the patient is stable?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	None	
Optional/General comments	None	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Sudhakar P
Department, University & Country	Sri Jayadeva Institute of Cardiovascular Sciences And Research, India