

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 66348

Title: Stent visualization methods to guide percutaneous coronary interventions and assess long-term patency

Reviewer's code: 02927080

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-27 01:05

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-08 07:09

Review time: 12 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors discussed percutaneous coronary intervention and this review report would provide better understanding coronary artery disease. Although the manuscript is well written, there are some problems as below. Major: Page 2, line 11, In abstract, authors described as “review novel stent visualization”. In conclusion, authors mentioned evaluation of PCI results. Did authors focus on stent visualization not PCI results? Page 5, line20, If authors focused on PCI results, they should introduce other technology (QFR, FFR and cardiac scintigraphy, etc). If not, they should focused stent visualization. If so, I guess NIRS and CMR are not able to evaluate ‘coronary stent’. Page 12, line 20, There are representative image of CCTA and IVUS. However, cases with OCT and NIRS are lacking. Minor, Abbreviation of QCA, DSE, CCTA and CMR are not necessary in abstract.