

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Puncture point bleeding is a common problem in clinical practice, which is likely to cause serious problems such as hematoma and even pseudoaneurysm. The author provides a good way to deal with this problem urgently, which is worthy of reference and promotion.

Reply: Thanks for your comments.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

1 **Title.** Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes. I only suggest to cite the site where the endovascular procedure was performed.

Thank you for your comment. As the reviewer suggested, we have revised the title.

From Rapid hemostasis of the residual access sites during endovascular procedures:

A case report

To Rapid hemostasis of the residual **inguinal** access sites during endovascular procedures: A case report

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes. 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, with minor revision. I suggest to be more specific about the size of the mass and the anatomical region in the abdomen (First paragraph of CASE PRESENTATION). I suggest to write the posology the same way as cilostazol was written (Third paragraph of CASE PRESENTATION).

Thank you for your comment. We have added anatomic location and the size

From An 82-year-old man presented with a pulsating mass over the abdomen.

To An 82-year-old man presented with a fist-sized pulsating mass on the periumbilical area.

We have revised the posology of Rivaroxaban the same way as cilostazole was written.

From He was on rivaroxaban 15 mg and cilostazol 200 mg/day.

To He was on rivaroxaban 15 mg/ day and cilostazol 200 mg/day.

5 **Methods**. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? No, I suggest to write a paragraph for the methods, describing how the authors chose the case, which documents were necessary to access the patient's files and how the literature review was made (describing the MeSH words used in the research, inclusion and exclusion criterias and database used as well).

Thank you for your comment. As the reviewer suggested, we have added methods. The journal guidelines did not clearly specify the location of the methods, so we put the Method section right before the Discussion. Since this paper is not for the systematic review, inclusion and exclusion criteria was not applied.

METHODS

This patient was selected for reporting because this was the first case of Surgical application for persistent oozing at access sites after pEVAR. The observed utility of this technique led to the decision to report this technique during surgery; therefore, no additional documents were required to access the patient's files. The MESH terms used for the literature review were "Endovascular Procedures/instrumentation*", "femoral artery", "hemostatic Techniques/instrumentation*", "Punctures/adverse effects", and "Cellulose, Oxidized/chemistry*" on PubMed.

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.

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? Yes.

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Not applicable.

10 **Units**. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes, with minor revision. I suggest not to abbreviate the time units, only to make the paper more formal.

Thank you for your comment. We changed the time units without using abbreviations.

From s and min

To seconds and minutes

Thank you for your comment. We

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? No comments needed.

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, with minor revision.

Thank you for your comment. We have gone through professional English proofreading again.

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript 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, the authors`manuscript used CARE Checklist.

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? The authors uploaded "Signed Consent for Treatment" in their native language.