

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com **https:**//www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 48271

Title: A Case of Brachiocephalic Artery Stenting Through the Carotid Artery

Reviewer's code: 01536400

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-06-24 01:25

Reviewer performed review: 2019-07-12 00:39

**Review time:** 17 Days and 23 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept	Peer-Review:
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ Y] Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Accept	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
[ ] Grade E: Do not	language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	[Y] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[ Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting case report about the brachiocephalic artery stenting through the carotid artery. The case is described in detail. The diagnosis and treatment are good. Figures are good. I suggest to delete the table, and add the laboratory test results in the main text. The English should be carefully checked and revised.



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

# INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:
[ ] The same title
[ ] Duplicate publication
[ ] Plagiarism
[Y] No
BPG Search:
[ ] The same title
[ ] Duplicate publication
[ ] Plagiarism
[Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com **https:**//www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 48271

Title: A Case of Brachiocephalic Artery Stenting Through the Carotid Artery

Reviewer's code: 01201032

Reviewer's country: Belgium

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-06-24 01:37

Reviewer performed review: 2019-07-12 01:45

**Review time:** 18 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	[ ] Accept	Peer-Review:
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[ Y] Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	[Y] Anonymous
[ ] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Accept	[ ] Onymous
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
[ ] Grade E: Do not	language polishing	[Y] Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	[ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Major revision	[ Y] Advanced
		[ ] Rejection	[ ] General
			[ ] No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			[ ] Yes
			[ Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, the authors reported a case of sustained the possibility and safety of brachiocephalic arterioplasty through a carotid artery. It also illustrates the feasibility of suturing the carotid puncture site with a suturing device. The femoral artery approach is the most common approach used for endovascular exclusion of the aorta. However, in



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com **https:**//www.wjgnet.com

cases involving an abnormal aortic arch or obvious distortion of the arteries, the trans-femoral approach is difficult to use because of its low success rate and high incidence of complications during the perioperative period. In addition to avoiding the occurrence of this situation and achieve faster and more effective hemostasis, the authors used a Perclose Proglide vascular stapler to suture the carotid puncture point. The manuscript is well written. The case is well present and discussed. I suggest to make a minor language editing before publication.

# INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:			
[	] The same title		
[	] Duplicate publication		
[	] Plagiarism		
[ Y ] No			
BPG Search:			
[	] The same title		
[	] Duplicate publication		
[	] Plagiarism		
Γ٦	′ ] No		