

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78844

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

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06335837

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brasil

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-18 14:09

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-30 23:05

Review time: 12 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

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. 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 cilostazole was written (Third paragraph of CASE PRESENTATION). 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). 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



**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>

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.
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. 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.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78844

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

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05904643

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-18

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-27 10:54

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-06 09:17

Review time: 8 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" 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>

**Peer-reviewer
statements**

Peer-Review: ☒ Anonymous ☐ Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: ☐ Yes ☒ No

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.