

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 53787

Title: Evaluation of ischemic lesions after carotid artery stenting with diffusion-weighted imaging

Reviewer's code: 02832130

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-30

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Zhou Tang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-08 13:49

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-16 08:24

Review time: 7 Days and 18 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript was to evaluate the numbers and volumes of ischemic lesions and their cerebral parenchymal and vascular distribution after CAS using DWI. 64 patients aged 42-84 diagnosed with carotid stenosis were included in this study. DWI examinations were carried out by a 1.5 T MR device one hour before and one hour after CAS. 39 new ischemic lesions were detected in 20 cases. The average number of new lesions after all CAS operations was 0.62. These new ischemic lesions were most common in the MCA territory, followed by the PCA territory and MCA-PCA watershed areas. New lesions were found in 31.2% (20/64) of patients. The volume of the lesions detected by the two observers was 1.10 cm³. The numbers of newly appearing ischemic lesions in DWI after CAS were significantly higher in cases where stenting was applied on the left side of the carotid artery and in cases where longer plaques were responsible for the narrowing in symptomatic patients. The stenosis rate was low in the group with ulcerated plaques. They finally emphasized that new ischemic lesions due to CAS appear mostly in the main arterial territory but they may also occur in watershed areas. This paper is very interesting, with potential significant effects on daily clinical practice; however, it suffers from many limitations.

1. What is the prognosis of the patients with these new cerebral ischemic lesions? Does the symptom disappear?
2. The background and INTRODUCTION section is well written and provides essential information's for the readers. However, the background section is relatively simple. What is the current determined status? How about other methods? Advantages of DWI? the author should explain more extensively the MRI basic principles of DWI, that they had subsequently analysed in their experience. Moreover, it is useful specify the difference between the standard MRI and the DWI. In this way the reader would have a clearer idea about the results that will be analysed later.
3. Manuscript needs an English editing, due to some



**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

errors. Such as: 1) In Core tip section: In this retrospective study, the numbers and volumes of new ischemic lesions, cerebral parenchymal and vascular distribution were investigated after carotid artery stenting (CAS) with diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI). After CAS, despite the detection of 39 newly arising ischemic lesions after the operation. Whether "After CAS "and "after the operation" are duplicate? 2) INTRODUCTION section:Among the leading causes of ischemic strokes such as transient ischemic attacks or cerebral infarction is stenosis in the proximal carotid artery as a result of atherosclerosis. It is very difficult to understand, please reword it..... 4. In the background section: "DWI examinations were carried out by a 1.5 T MR device one hour before and after the operations. Ischemic lesions emerging in the first 24 hours following the operation were considered new lesions". The duration is one hour before CAS, What is the time duration after CAS? one hour? first 24 hours? Whether the author observed the new lesions 1 hour or 24 hours after CAS? It was very confusing. This issue is also the core and important issue of this article. 5. In front of INTRODUCTION section: the sentence: Beyhan M, Acu B, Gokce E, Firat MM. Evaluation of ischemic lesions after carotid artery stenting with diffusion-weighted imaging. Should it be deleted? Please check it. 6. Carotid endarterectomy or carotid artery stenting (CAS) are the methods proposed to prevent ischemic strokes. At present, the main and effective treatment of carotid stenosis is carotid endarterectomy or CAS. How to choose carotid endarterectomy or CAS? 7. Radiologic Evaluation section: The author wrote: All cases had two DWI examinations, one hour before and an hour after the procedure using a 1.5 T MR machine (Signa Excite HDx12.0 M5B software; GE Healthcare, Milwaukee, WI, US.....Ischemic lesions detected in the first 24 hours after the procedure were considered as new. What is the duration after CAS? one hour? first 24 hours? Whether the author observed the new lesions 1 hour or 24 hours after CAS? It is confusing me. 8. What is the shortest time for MRI to detect new ischemic lesions? Why the author



**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

considers 1 hour or 24 hours? 9. CAS operation time (duration)? 10. What are the causes of new ischemic focus? In general, the causes of new ischemic focus are plaque falling off during operation, or falling off from stent hole after stent placement. What are the reasons in this group, and how to avoid them? 11. Current medical guidelines suggest the use of embolism protection devices during CAS to prevent periprocedural ischemic events. What is the reason that some cases do not use embolism protection devices during CAS? 12. Picture: good. 13. Tables: please refer to the format of journal.

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: 53787

Title: Evaluation of ischemic lesions after carotid artery stenting with diffusion-weighted imaging

Reviewer's code: 00503243

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-30 13:53

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-18 13:37

Review time: 18 Days and 23 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" 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 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



**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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is interesting and facing a problem extremely debated to date. The main limitations of the study are that the study is retrospective and the lack of a control group subjected to operation instead of stenting. Indeed one of the to date problem is the choice between stenting and interventional procedure. Anyway the manuscript is well written and merit to be published

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: 53787

Title: Evaluation of ischemic lesions after carotid artery stenting with diffusion-weighted imaging

Reviewer's code: 03699990

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-30

Reviewer chosen by: Jin-Zhou Tang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-11 03:05

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-23 06:42

Review time: 12 Days and 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input 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	(High priority)	<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper seems to have room for improvement as following. In RESULTS part of Abstract:" The volume of the lesions detected by the two observers was 1.10 cm³." What was the sentence used to express? In MATERIALS AND METHODS, please provide the definition for ulcerated plaques and Corresponding MR picture. In RESULTS, Please specify statistical methods in the purple part of the text. In DISCUSSION, what is the basis for conclusion in the last sentence (the purple part of the text) of paragraph 2? The syntax and expression of the paper need to be greatly improved. Please check in the red part of the text whether there are any spelling mistakes, improper use of words, incomplete expression and so on. Please refer to other reviewers' comments.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 53787

Title: Evaluation of ischemic lesions after carotid artery stenting with diffusion-weighted imaging

Reviewer's code: 00503243

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-30

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Qiao Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-02 08:07

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-02 12:05

Review time: 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" 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 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



**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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript faces the important problem of cerebral lesions after carotid artery stenting due to atherosclerotic lesions. The manuscript is well written, complete and each chapter is well described including the DWI to find new lesions after CAS, the statistical chapter and the discussion. The literature is complete and updated. The manuscript findings are particularly important for physicians to compare CSA with surgical thromboarterectomy.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No