

Author Responses to Company Editor-in-Chief Comments

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Cardiology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Thank you very much for considering our manuscript for publication in World Journal of Cardiology – we are very excited to hear that it is conditionally accepted. We have updated Table 1 to have only the 3-lines requested, we removed any carriage returns, and we aligned all contents of each cell to the editing specifications. There was not a grant application form, as the data collection for this study was supported by a private company.

Author Responses to Science Editor Comments

Although the paper is technically sound, depth in the research study and its relevance with the research methodology is very strong. The authors should add more references regarding a biologic and non-biologic envelopes.

Thank you for your review of our manuscript. According to yours and Reviewer #2's suggestion, we have added more references and text regarding biologic and non-biologic envelopes. This new addition can be found on page 12 of the revised manuscript.

Author Responses to Reviewer Comments

We thank the reviewers for their helpful comments. They spent their time considering important aspects of the manuscript that could be improved. We hope that our comments below are able to address all their concerns.

Reviewer #1

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.

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. According to the language quality score B that you had assigned, we have made updates to improve the language quality for a Grade A.

Reviewer #2

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.

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and for your helpful suggestions to increase the strength of our manuscript. According to the language quality score B that you had assigned, we have made updates to improve the language quality for a Grade A. We have also added more references and text regarding biologic and non-biologic envelopes, which can be found on page 12 of the revised manuscript.