

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 86356

**Title:** Removal of a pulmonary artery foreign body during pulse ablation in a patient with atrial fibrillation: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05189761

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBBS, MD

**Professional title:** Research Fellow, Staff Physician

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-06-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-20 13:51

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-07-20 14:02

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this case report authors discuss about removing a foreign body during an ablation procedure. I have the following questions

1. Discuss what symptoms brought the patient to hospital
2. Mention patient resting HR and Afib HR
3. Was patient in SR? If not mention Variable heart sounds and tachycardia in physical exam. Mention BMI, BP in physical exam
4. Mention LVEF, Chamber enlargement, pulmonary veins and LAVI details. Mention no diastolic dysfunction
5. Explain how did the foreign body got there in the first place?
6. Why was the patient not on Antiplatelet/ DOAC. Write CHADVASC score
7. In discussion add more content and citations
8. Needs extensive revision and English editing and case formatting

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 86356

**Title:** Removal of a pulmonary artery foreign body during pulse ablation in a patient with atrial fibrillation: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02723778

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-06-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-18 17:38

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-07-23 10:01

**Review time:** 4 Days and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Criteria Checklist for New Manuscript Peer-Review: See first part of Specific comments to the authors

Specific comments to the authors

1. The abstract is poor and does not reflect the case. Many readers will only read the abstract and others will read the rest of the case report depending on whether they find the abstract interesting.
2. In the case presentation, all the headings (Chief complaints, History of past illness, etc) should be linked together in a one or two paragraph narrative.
3. Between that point and TREATMENT, there should be a description of the steps taken and at what point the complication may have occurred. This should be the longest part of the manuscript, as it is the part that adds novelty. The removal of a foreign body with a snare is not uncommon in Cath Lab activity.
4. The novelty and interest of the case is that it is, to my knowledge, the first occurrence of a foreign body in an electroporation ablation. This technique is being presented as almost free of complications, when this is not the case. The description on how the complication could have occurred is the basis of the case. The treatment, being important (and being the most documented by the authors with their video), is not the main aspect of the case.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 86356

**Title:** Removal of a pulmonary artery foreign body during pulse ablation in a patient with atrial fibrillation: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02723778

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-06-16

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-10 17:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-14 02:43

**Review time:** 3 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

B) General comments for the authors R et al have extensively modified the submitted manuscript. The revised version has been greatly improved and highlights the importance of the reported case, the dissemination of which is important as it is very easy to be repeated and should be taken into account, especially in less experienced operators. I have described only minor modifications to improve the style, and in my opinion it is now ready for publication in World Journal of Clinical Cases. C) Specific comments for the authors 1. Abstract.- 1) "Iatrogenic" should be changed to interventional. 2) CASE SUMMARY: -Move this part of the Background to Case Summary: "We describe a case in which a linear foreign body suddenly appeared on imaging during pulsed ablation of atrial fibrillation. Multiposition angiography showed that the foreign body was currently lodged in the pulmonary artery but was hemodynamically stable. We then chose to use an interventional approach to remove the foreign body from the pulmonary artery. This foreign body was subsequently confirmed to be from the hydrophilic coating of the guidewire surface. This may be related to the difficulties encountered during the puncture of the femoral vein. This is a rare, and serious complication of femoral vein puncture". -In this paragraph, . "on imaging" should be changed to "fluoroscopy" (or similar). . " This is a rare, and serious" to "This is a rare, but serious". 3) BACKGROUND .I would suggest to modify in this sense: "Foreign bodies in the pulmonary circulation have been documented in the literature, mostly caused by interventional procedures. However, reports of pulmonary artery foreign bodies during femoral vein puncture are rare and there is no description of such complication from the guidewire surface flows into the pulmonary artery during a pulse ablation in a patient with atrial fibrillation". 2) Introduction.- 1) "Therefore, we report this case in order to



**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>

avoid a similar situation.” should be changed to something as “Therefore, careful manipulation of guidewire is essential to prevent a similar situation”. 3) Treatment.- 1) Suppress the part of anesthetic, as it is non-relevant. 2) It would be convenient to describe the first puncture and its material employed. 3) In the sentence: “...However, when we started to ablate the right inferior pulmonary vein, a strange phenomenon appeared. X-ray showed a linear foreign body...”, delete “, a strange phenomenon appeared”. CONCLUSION 1) I would advise adding: “....(and not so beginners)” 2) I would recommend ending with the same sentence as the abstract: “.....Mismatches between interventional devices from different manufacturers used for femoral venipuncture may result in pulmonary artery foreign bodies.