



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_48678
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF BALLOON CATHETER ANGIOPLASTY ALONE FOR RECURRENT BILATERAL RENAL ARTERY RESTENOSIS AND QUICK DETERIORATION FOR HEMODIALYSIS: AN ALTERNATIVE FOR IN-STENT RESTENOSIS
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>This manuscript reports a clinical case of recurring bilateral renal artery stenosis with decreased renal function in a 62 y.o. female patient. Worsening of serum creatinine was used as an indication of deteriorating renal function whereas increased blood pressure was used as an indicator of RAAS activation following atherosclerotic renal artery stenosis. The conclusion of the study is that percutaneous renal intervention with no-stenting in bilateral on-stent restenosis may contribute to reversing renal dysfunction even in patients undergoing previous intervention.</p> <p>Comments: the article is properly written and can be followed with relative ease. Perhaps reporting the values in a table would facilitate comparison between initial values and recurring conditions to the final outcome.</p>	Thank you so much for your comments. We inserted the table as requested. Please see Appendix.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	