

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JAMMR_88425  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of Coronary Stent Expansion during Percutaneous Coronary Interventions using Stent Boost Visualization in comparison with Intravascular Ultrasound |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article   |

### 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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>Add mm measurement to figure 2 y-axis</p> <p>Figure 2, I don't see how the agreement could be considered 'optimal' as the spread of values is quite wide. Consider revising descriptive word like 'good' and 'optimal'.</p> <p>Figure 3, case presentation 1, middle panel should read "SB" instead of QCA which is used twice.</p>                        |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      |   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | Overall a great study to conduct, excellent idea, and appears to have been conducted properly with blinded analysis of the QCA and SB images. Increasing the number of subjects would have made this an even more impactful study. The authors provide a reasonable summary of the prior literature that allows some comparison of the context of this study. |   |

### 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:                            | Arnold H. Seto                |
| Department, University & Country | University of California, USA |