

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57598

**Title:** Safety and performance of EverPro™ everolimus-eluting coronary stent system with biodegradable polymer in real-world scenario

**Reviewer's code:** 02948419

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-18 13:29

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-06-19 18:42

**Review time:** 1 Day and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<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**

Authors reported research paper in which safety and performance of the EverPro® EES in patients with coronary artery disease at 1-year clinical follow-up were determined. This is an observational, retrospective, single-centre study, the main conclusion of which was that EverPro® EES is a safe and effective treatment option with no MACE or stent thrombosis reported up to 1-year study period. The weakness of the study is retrospective design, the benefit of the study is evidence regarding that the cobalt-chromium platform design of the second generation of ESS was safe and effective. The findings of the study deserve to be published, but I have several concerns regarding design and methodology. 1. The design is declared as retrospective, but description of it was done as prospective. Please, check and explain. If study had retrospective design, please, report statistical power calculation, and prospective design requires reporting sample size calculation. 2. Flow chart with clear criteria of inclusion / non-inclusion is required. 3. Ethical declaration is needed, IRB name and date of approval of the protocol are necessary. 4. Sectiona Results should contain clear description of the entire patient population including co-morbidities, concomitant medications and related procedures. 5. Collection of MACEs should be reported in separate paragraph. 6. Data of severity of MI and TIMI risk score are needed to easily understand the study limitations 7. MACEs evaluation should be done thoroughly, please check and re-write.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 57598

**Title:** Safety and performance of EverPro™ everolimus-eluting coronary stent system with biodegradable polymer in real-world scenario

**Reviewer's code:** 02948419

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** Pan Huang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-10-18 07:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-10-18 07:14

**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>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

Authors reported a revised version of the paper that was corrected according to the reviewer comments. I am completely satisfied. The paper in the revised version can be accepted for further processing