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Title: Aldehyde Dehydrogenase 2(ALDH2) Genotypes and In-stent Restenosis in Chinese Han Patients after Percutaneous Coronary Intervention

Comments to the authors:

The authors studied the association of between Aldehyde Dehydrogenase 2(ALDH2) Genotypes and In-stent Restenosis in Chinese Han Patients after Percutaneous Coronary Intervention. This study reports negative results as the association is driven by other risk factors, mainly diabetes. However, study provides clinically important information for the patients, despite their possible genetic background, diabetes is matter of treatment to reduce the risk of restenosis.

1. In the title you have with errors written 'Chinses' and it should be changed to 'Chinese'.

2. In the abstract section within the background the authors stated 'In-stent restenosis is a serious adverse result of PCI'. Restenosis per definition is defined as primary PCI complication and not a serious adverse event. Can you elaborate further?

3. In the abstract section within the background the authors stated, 'PCI which is a significant treatment for CAD'. Primary PCI is recommended treatment for CAD.

4. In abstract section with methods, you do not show the number of patients included in the study. Please do that.
5. In introduction section, the authors stated, '. The treatment of CAD mainly depends on drug therapies, including antiatherogenic drugs (such as statins) and endothelial protective drugs (such as ACEIs). Percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) is an important way to promote the reperfusion of patients who have suffered from acute coronary syndrome (ACS). I disagree with first sentence as drug treatment are the treatment options for CAD and PCI is treatment of recommendation if symptoms persist despite the drug treatment. And also, with second sentence as PCI is important treatment in acute only but also in stable CAD if symptoms persist with drug therapy.

6. In the method section, the authors used heading as 'Human subjects', please change that to 'Study population'.

7. In methods section, it is not clear how many patients have been diagnosed with ACS? How many underwent PCI and how many returned to hospital for re-examination and were diagnosed with re-stenosis? How many met inclusion criteria and how many met exclusion criteria? Finally, to end up with 531 patients included in the study.

8. In the method section: Definition of the in-stent restenosis, the authors stated that the Academic Research Consortium considered the definition of ISR. So, the question is what is the role of Academic research Consortium? Does this body provide the treatment guidelines in China? If yes, based on which scientific evidence? Is there any published document? If not, then please refer to most recent guidelines of ESC and AHA.

9. In following sentence you did to similar document (reference 14) but the PCI field has been improved so much that the reference of year 1999 might be inappropriate today. Please additionally refer to most recent important guidelines issued by ESC and AHA.

10. Next, the authors stated 'The results of the luminal narrowing and the in-stent restenosis were confirmed by two experienced interventional cardiologists according to guidelines for cardiovascular diagnoses. Can you please explain the experience of cardiologists? Did you perform intra-and-inter reader reproducibility? And according to which guidelines the cardiologist confirmed diagnoses?'
11. In Statistical analysis section, the authors mentioned 'Interaction terms with p value'. Did you test any interaction term?

12. All tables need improvements. Please provide a footnote to each table to describe the univariate and multivariate models.
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