

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**Manuscript NO:** 31719

**Title:** Diagnosis and Management Challenges of In-Stent Restenosis in Coronary Arteries

**Reviewer's code:** 00236103

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-05

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting and important overview on diagnosis and challenges of in-stent restenosis in coronary arteries. However, there are several important issues to be considered for further improvement of the paper with respect to readability, scientifically critical assessments and actuality: 1. formal issues: --> give a list of all abbreviations --> shorten the paper: Especially shorten the chapter dealing with restenosis treatment starting with line 240. Do not simply report all the single results of numerous restenosis studies rather than give an comprehensive overview referring to the actual meta-analyses. Otherwise you may summarize the single studies in a comprehensive table --> the number of figures showing clinical examples (coronary angiograms) should be reduced. Only take examples representing the highest clinical and illustrative impact 2. scientific considerations: --> unfortunately the review more or less restrains on local mechanisms of restenosis and technical issues with regard to stenting or re-stenting with different devices. Potential effects of more or less adherence to



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

secondary prevention measures/activities (e.g. smoking, cholesterol lowering, exercise training, risk diseases like diabetes, adherence to medication etc.) have not been addressed at all. It is a "must" to critically include such considerations. --> restenosis also strongly may depend on the morphologic conditions of the first PCI (e.g. high risk intervention? diffuse three vessel disease? acute or elective intervention? etc.). Especially the readiness for risk interventions of the interventional cardiologist may influence the outcome. The authors should critically reflect this point. 3. Actuality: --> the estimation of bioresorbable scaffolds should be updated by citing the results of the ABSORB-II-Study. These results did not fulfill the primary expectations so far.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**Manuscript NO:** 31719

**Title:** Diagnosis and Management Challenges of In-Stent Restenosis in Coronary Arteries

**Reviewer's code:** 00227375

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-12-05

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an excellent review about the diagnosis and management of in-stent restenosis in coronary arteries. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. I have no question about this manuscript.