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Reviewer's report:

You started the procedure with a 6 fr right femoral artery sheath. Considering the standard size of the sheath, why didn't you choose a radial artery access? As previously published in this paper: Seven french radial artery access for PCI: a prospective single-center experience, a larger radial artery sheath is feasible and well tolerated by the patients. (please mention this study DOI: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2014.07.134)

You decide to proceed, first of all, with an antegrade approach. Considering that ISR are often tough lesions, it would be easily to proceed with a retrograde approach. The distal cap of a long lesion is softer than the proximal one. Can you justify your decision? Can you also describe the characteristic of the collateral (septal) channels?

Which would be your second-choice guidewire in case of Hi-Torque failure?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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