

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30686

Title: Coronary stenting: A matter of revascularization

Reviewer's code: 00233953

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-17 11:15

Date reviewed: 2016-10-19 01:14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Superficial review: Comment #1: a discussion about indication for PCI/stent is missing. What lesions should be treated with stenting versus medical care? What is the benefit and in which populations? Comment #2: add discussion about alternative CABG

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30686

Title: Coronary stenting: A matter of revascularization

Reviewer's code: 02474355

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-17 11:15

Date reviewed: 2016-10-21 23:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Bonaventura et al from First Clinic of Internal Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Genoa School of Medicine, Italy have performed an updated review of percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) and the use of balloon catheters either bare metal (BMSs) or drug-eluting stents (DESs). This review focuses on old and new problems, in particular the need of dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT), which is a fundamental moment in view of the good outcome duration, but also deals with bleeding complications. It points also to some more recent advances including bioresorbable stents potentially changing the future of revascularization techniques as the concept bases upon the degradation of the stent scaffold to inert particles after its function expired, thus theoretically eliminating risks linked with both stent thrombosis and re-stenosis whose consequences were so heavy in the past and represented the bulk of the problems with these techniques.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 30686

Title: Coronary stenting: A matter of revascularization

Reviewer's code: 00977342

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-10-17 11:15

Date reviewed: 2016-10-23 22:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written Editorial. I have no comments or critics except the legend for Figure 1. "cardiac artery disease" may be written as "coronary artery disease".