

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Cardiology*

Manuscript NO: 72358

Title: Risk profiles and outcomes of patients receiving antibacterial cardiovascular implantable electronic device envelopes: A retrospective analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05936182

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-19 04:31

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-19 04:41

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. I don't feel qualified to judge about the English language and style due to not native language.

1. The title reflect the main subject about antibiotics related cardiovascular implantable electronic device, title was clear and easy to understand.
2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript.
3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.
4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. The authors explain in CIED number and rate of infection in many countries.
5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects were clear, with demonstrate IRB number or text to human ethics consideration.
6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study.
7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically.
8. Tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents.
9. The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics.
10. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Cardiology*

Manuscript NO: 72358

Title: Risk profiles and outcomes of patients receiving antibacterial cardiovascular implantable electronic device envelopes: A retrospective analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04334222

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor, Instructor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-11 12:59

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-11 13:57

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

The paper is technically sound. Depth in the research study and its relevance with the research methodology is very strong. The substantiation of Results and their authenticity permit to concluded that the nfections at the CIED implantation site have serious morbidity, mortality, and economic consequences. The use of antibacterial envelopes may reduce the risk of infection and could potentially reduce these serious complications and healthcare costs. Limitations to this study include non-randomization of patients to the treatment groups, a fairly short period of follow up, and all implantations being performed by a single physician at one institution. The discussion included 32 references. I suggest included more references regarding a biologic and non-biologic envelopes.