



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 45281

**Title:** Safety of the improved patent ductus arteriosus occluder for transcatheter closure of perimembranous ventricular septal defects with abnormally attached tricuspid chordae tendineae

**Reviewer’s code:** 03251363

**Reviewer’s country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-12-23

**Date reviewed:** 2018-12-25

**Review time:** 23 Hours, 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Interesting work on the approach of Transcatheter closure of perimembranous ventricular septal defects with abnormally attached tricuspid chordae tendineae using



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

an improved patent ductus arteriosus occluder. The manuscript describes a series of clinical cases treated by a new transcatheter device. It is an interesting approach, although it will require multicenter randomized studies. The manuscript is simple, since it is a descriptive study, however, since it is a recently patented device, it can lead to the development of studies of greater clinical importance.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 45281

**Title:** Safety of the improved patent ductus arteriosus occluder for transcatheter closure of perimembranous ventricular septal defects with abnormally attached tricuspid chordae tendineae

**Reviewer's code:** 02954382

**Reviewer's country:** Kosovo

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-12-23

**Date reviewed:** 2018-12-26

**Review time:** 11 Hours, 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Reviewer's report I read the manuscript. There are some typographical errors. The authors should correct these mistakes. 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Generally Yes. I think that the title will better reflect the core of the manuscript if it starts as: The safety of the improved ..... 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Generally yes. But in the section "Results", authors should include patients' characteristics 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes. Research progress in the field is evaluation of the new treatment procedure based on improved device 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Generally Yes 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes At the end of the manuscript in the section " Article Highlights" all sub-sections are wrongly added to the manuscript, because in this section is prescribed something else, not the topic of the manuscript.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No