



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Cardiology*

**Manuscript NO:** 72358

**Title:** Risk profiles and outcomes of patients receiving antibacterial cardiovascular implantable electronic device envelopes: A retrospective analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05936182

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Thailand

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-12-19 04:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-12-19 04:41

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. I don't feel qualified to judge about the English language and style due to not native language. 1. The title reflect the main subject about antibiotics related cardiovascular implantable electronic device, title was clear and easy to understand. 2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. 3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. The authors explain in CIED number and rate of infection in many countries. 5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects were clear, with demonstrate IRB number or text to human ethics consideration. 6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study. 7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. 8. Tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9. The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics. 10. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Cardiology*

**Manuscript NO:** 72358

**Title:** Risk profiles and outcomes of patients receiving antibacterial cardiovascular implantable electronic device envelopes: A retrospective analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04334222

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Doctor, Instructor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-11 12:59

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-11 13:57

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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 paper is technically sound. Depth in the research study and its relevance with the research methodology is very strong. The substantiation of Results and their authenticity permit to concluded that the nfections at the CIED implantation site have serious morbidity, mortality, and economic consequences. The use of antibacterial envelopes may reduce the risk of infection and could potentially reduce these serious complications and healthcare costs. Limitations to this study include non-randomization of patients to the treatment groups, a fairly short period of follow up, and all implantations being performed by a single physician at one institution. The discussion included 32 references. I suggest included more references regarding a biologic and non-biologic envelopes.