

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 34335

Title: Randomized study comparing incidence of radial artery occlusion post-percutaneous coronary intervention between two conventional compression devices using a novel air-inflation technique

Reviewer's code: 00259340

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-05-10

Date reviewed: 2017-05-10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present here a Prospective randomized study comparing the incidence of radial artery occlusion post-transradial percutaneous coronary intervention between two radial compression devices using a novel air-inflation technique, with about 100 patients. The manuscript is well written and the main limitations acknowledged in the paper. The overall interest is mainly limited due to the restricted field of study. However, the final result is pretty correct. As minor suggestions - State the type of p (two tail?) - A pair of pictures with the devices would probably be a good idea for the reader. - Discussion. Are these devices better than manual compression? What about costs? Elaborate. To sum up, my feeling here is this is a nice little trial that, if slightly improved, could be acceptable for publication.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 34335

Title: Randomized study comparing incidence of radial artery occlusion post-percutaneous coronary intervention between two conventional compression devices using a novel air-inflation technique

Reviewer's code: 02636166

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-06-15

Date reviewed: 2017-06-19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor: In general, the paper is well written. There is only concern regarding statistical power in this study?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 34335

Title: Randomized study comparing incidence of radial artery occlusion post-percutaneous coronary intervention between two conventional compression devices using a novel air-inflation technique

Reviewer's code: 00227375

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-06-15

Date reviewed: 2017-06-21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting manuscript about the comparison of post-PCI radial artery occlusion (RAO) incidence between two conventional radial artery compression devices using a novel air-inflation technique, Safeguard Radial and TR band. The authors demonstrated that there were no significant differences between two devices, and that only one patient in the Safeguard Radial group developed RAO at 24hours. This manuscript is nicely structured. However, I have several comments about this manuscript. Please consider the following comments. (Comments) 1. Table 2 and Table 3 As for the indication (Table 2), number of target vessels (Table 3), and target vessels (Table 3), the authors should describe "p-value". 2. Table 4 The authors probably make a mistake. I think, as for hematoma, a p-value is not 0.70, but 0.078. So, the incidences of hematoma in the Safeguard Radial group tended to be higher than

those in the TR band group. The authors should make mention of these matters in the results and/or discussion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 34335

Title: Randomized study comparing incidence of radial artery occlusion post-percutaneous coronary intervention between two conventional compression devices using a novel air-inflation technique

Reviewer's code: 01593993

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-06-15

Date reviewed: 2017-06-23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors performed a randomized trial comparing 2 different radial compression devices using a novel air-inflation technique. A total of 107 patients were randomized to safeguard vs TR band compression devices. Radial artery occlusion rate was compared between devices at 24h and 6 weeks. Radial occlusion rate was very low at 24 h (2% vs 0%) and at 6 weeks (0% in both arms). The new technique might play a role in these results. Main comments: - It is not described how sample calculation was performed. Clearly with such low rate of endpoint the final sample size (86 patients) may be underpower. Please elaborate on that. - Please check the actual numbers: in the abstract a total of 100 patients are randomized. In the text, it is reported a total of 107. - 16% of missing patients is too high in my view and may change the results in one way or another... This is an important limitation. - To demonstrate whether it is the novel



**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

air-inflation technique responsible of such good results, the authors should compared the outcomes of any of both compression devices with this technique or with the classical technique.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 34335

Title: Randomized study comparing incidence of radial artery occlusion post-percutaneous coronary intervention between two conventional compression devices using a novel air-inflation technique

Reviewer's code: 02446706

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2017-06-15

Date reviewed: 2017-06-25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Table 1 is unnecessary and be omitted. It should be included in the text.