



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Cardiology and Research.</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ AJCR_67691</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Comparison Of Immediate Outcomes of Redo Percutaneous Transvenous Mitral Commissurotomy with the First Percutaneous Transvenous Mitral Commissurotomy - A Retrospective Analysis</b>
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Abstract – Results:</b> Difficult to read, it could be better to limit the result presentation to the mean parameters (i.e. MVA, MR) and refer the detailed description of the other parameters to the following sections.</li> <li>- <b>Introduction:</b> please add the meaning of the PBMV acronym.</li> <li>- <b>Results:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: please hint in text at hemodynamic parameters reported in Tab.2 (something like that: "Values of the investigated hemodynamic parameters are reported in Tab.2")</li> <li>o 12-13<sup>th</sup> paragraphs: please join these two paragraphs into one, because the reported results are referred to the evaluation of the same parameter (MR grade), and Fig.5 does not depict the values described in the first part (paragraph 12).</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Tab.1:</b> how is it possible to explain the sense of this parameter values? Please add a short caption, if possible.</li> <li>- <b>Tab.2:</b> not only hemodynamic data are reported (e.g. age). Maybe could the title be more generic? Furthermore, a short caption could be useful to the reading of data and to their meaning understanding (e.g. What does the increment of MVA mean? What does the decrease of gradient/pressure mean?).</li> <li>- <b>Tab.3:</b> in rows 0-I-II grading of MR, referring to the column 'Before PTMC', the values reported for both the First and Redo groups are different from those presented in text (paragraph 12): please, have a check. It could be useful to add a short caption describing the evolution of MR (e.g. the MR severity overall increases/decreases; Number of affected patients increases/decreases with the procedure; MR is more frequent immediately after the procedure of after one year...).</li> <li>Furthermore, it would be necessary to specify that the percentage reported in brackets in column 'Total' is a mean value.</li> <li>- <b>Discussion:</b> it is a bit difficult to read (see the comment about Abstract Results). It would be important to highlight and go deep to the less favourable patient characteristics more (i.e. presence of calcifications and/or atrial fibrillation, age of patients, ...).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please pay attention to the required capital letters both in text and in Tables/Figures (e.g. "<u>W</u>ilkins" in paragraph 5 of Results section; "mm<u>H</u>g" in Tab.2, Figs.2-4...).</li> <li>- Repetition of the form "In (the) present study" is excessive and redundant, particularly in the Results section. Please remove or find a synonym.</li> <li>- Please pay attention to expression of percentage (i.e. "...% <u>of</u> patients", the preposition is often lacking).</li> <li>- <b>Discussion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Line 5: with "reserved <u>in</u>", do you mean "reserved <u>to/for</u>"?</li> <li>o Line 40-41: "..., at the end of 1 year, ..." it is clear what you meant but it sounds bad. Please add "... after the procedure".</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <b>Tab.2:</b> it would be useful to separate rows regarding the evaluation of the same parameter at different moment (e.g. between 'After PTCM mean MV gradient' and 'Before PTCM Pulmonary artery mean pressure') with a ticker table line, in order to make the reading easier.</li> </ul>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<b>Optional/General</b> comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Laura Mazzocchi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Pavia, Italy</b>