

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28962

**Title:** Comparison between the SAPIEN S3 and the SAPIEN XT transcatheter heart valves: A single-center experience

**Reviewer's code:** 00225245

**Reviewer's country:** Czech Republic

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-26 09:44

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-04 20:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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

The entire text of submitted paper should be shortened. It is essential for readers and it definitely improve the final quality of above paper. If abbreviation PVL (on page 2) is not a typo error, it should be listed and explained as well further - Page 4. Finally, I have no major criticism and I regard the work near to ready for publication.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28962

**Title:** Comparison between the SAPIEN S3 and the SAPIEN XT transcatheter heart valves: A single-center experience

**Reviewer's code:** 00258955

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-26 09:44

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-11 07:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 study describes a single center TAVR experience comparing outcomes between the Edwards XT and S3 valves up to one year. It found that although mortality rates were similar between the valves, the S3 valve had dramatically fewer vascular complications and twice the pacemaker rate. The study also lists predictors of permanent pacemaker implantation and offers clinical advice based on the observations of coaxial position of the valve at implantation. The paper is well written and offers a fairly large comparison of the performance of these 2 valves. The results are similar to those previously reported and the description of coaxial positioning in the discussion could be clinically useful.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28962

**Title:** Comparison between the SAPIEN S3 and the SAPIEN XT transcatheter heart valves: A single-center experience

**Reviewer's code:** 00211908

**Reviewer's country:** Netherlands

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-26 09:44

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-13 13:30

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this single centre experience of comparison of Sapien S3 and XT-THV TAVI, no significant difference in 30-day mortality was found between the two valves and major vascular complications were lower in the S3 group compared with XT-THV group in the expense of increased permanent pacemaker implantation. The outlined predictors of permanent pacemaker implantation included antecedent RBBB, PR interval and loss of coaxiality during device deployment. Minor error: Page 2: Line 17: PVL may be altered to PVR.