



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 39032

Title: Undiscovered pathology of transient scaffolding remains a driver of failures in clinical trials

Reviewer's code: 00227375

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-04-10

Date reviewed: 2018-04-11

Review time: 1 Day

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an excellent systematic review about the multimodality imaging studies of bioresorbable vascular scaffolds. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. I have no question about this manuscript.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, 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



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 39032

Title: Undiscovered pathology of transient scaffolding remains a driver of failures in clinical trials

Reviewer's code: 00504150

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2018-03-28

Date reviewed: 2018-04-19

Review time: 22 Days

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is a systematic review of transient scaffold associated arterial remodeling. Overall I found the paper extremely well written and well carried out. 1. The title identifies this as a systematic review but may be too long. 2. Abstract: The abstract is



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

structured, states the objectives, and states the main conclusions. It does not state the inclusion/exclusion criteria, databases searched or methods for quality assessment. 3. Methods: The paper does give sufficient detail on how the study was conducted including databases, search criteria, and dates. Two reviewers carried out the searches independently and did not mention a third to judge discrepancies. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were explicitly stated. The author judged study quality using standard criteria. Primary and secondary objectives were clearly stated and the data would be available from the reports. Statistical analysis is well described except that handling of missing data was not considered. Given the nature of the analysis individual patient level data was not available. 4. Results. The paper did not provide a flow diagram of the abstracted data as recommended. Tables were provided that described trial size, intervention, etc. 5. Discussion: The reviewers appeared to be fair but complete in their analysis. They importantly identify the limitations of the data available, particularly the short term follow up and lack of hard endpoints. This study highlights the limitations in our knowledge.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

[] Plagiarism

[Y] No