

January 22, 2017

Manuscript NO: 31907 – Transcervical Access, Reversal of Flow and Mesh-covered Stents: The New Options in the Armamentarium of Carotid Artery Stenting.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your comments and suggestions regarding our manuscript entitled “Transcervical Access, Reversal of Flow and Mesh-covered Stents: The New Options in the Armamentarium of Carotid Artery Stenting.”

We have revised our manuscript accordingly. Below is a point-by-point response to the Reviewer comments:

Reviewer 1:

I really appreciated this very complete review about carotid artery stenting. I have only some considerations to make, in order to improve this work further. 1) I would cite the recent results of 10 years of CREST trial and of the ACT I trial that confirm the equipoise between CAS and CEA. I would cite the wide registry of Stabile and coll., regarding the use of MoMa device in more than 1200 consecutive patients, with excellent results. 2) I would better divide the subjects in order to make the presentation easier to be understood. First the introduction, secondly the introduction of the proximal protection devices (nowadays only the MoMa is approved), third the alternative radial access (in particular what the advantages can be carried by such approach compared to the femoral) as well as the carotid one. Finally the new mesh covered stents.

Response: The 10-year results of CREST and the ACT I trial have been cited and discussed as you suggested. The registry of Stabile et al has also been cited. We have tried to use the proposed subject definition where appropriate. However, please note

**that some studies compare 2 different methods so they do not fit into one category.
Please let us know if you are not pleased with the current presentation.**

Reviewer 2:

It is an interesting summary of the various technology advances in the field of CAS.

Response:

We thank Reviewer 2 for his/her kind words.

Reviewer 3:

To use appropriate words for the advantages of CAS. Some words may be too aggressive in the conclusions.

Response:

Our conclusions have been modified. Please let us know if you are satisfied with the revised conclusions.

We hope you find our response to the Reviewer comments as well as the modifications made to the text satisfactory.

We would also like to inform you that we have no conflicts of interest.

We look forward to your decision.

Best regards

Kosmas I. Paraskevas

Frank J. Veith