

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19861

Title: Coronary physiology assessment in the catheterization laboratory

Reviewer's code: 00503474

Reviewer's country: Saudi Arabia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-05-26 15:32

Date reviewed: 2015-06-03 00:46

| 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 checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | | 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

Journal: WJC Title: CORONARY PHYSIOLOGY ASSESSMENT IN THE CATHETERIZATION LABORATORY Manuscript category: Review article Overall publication value of the article: 1. Is the subject an important one? :Yes 2. Does the article possess scientific and practical value?:yes 3. Is the paper scientifically accurate? Yes 4. Does the paper fit the scope of the journal? :Yes 5. Is the title and abstract informative and do they give a clear idea of what to expect from the paper? Yes 6. Does the title bring the main message of the study?: Yes 7. Is the abstract presented in structured form? : Yes 8. Does the abstract give an adequate picture of the entire article? Yes 9. Is the background of the study made clear and helpful to readers unfamiliar with the subject? Yes 10. Is the purpose of the article clearly stated?: Yes 11. Is the interpretation of the article clearly presented and adequately supported by the evidence adduced?: Yes 12. Are the conclusions logically valid and justified by the evidence adduced?: yes . however, most data in conclusion should be shifted to discussion and conclusion should be shortened. 13. Are all the figures and tables adequate and necessary?: Yes 14. Is the reference section adequate or is it too long and should it be cut down?: References are inconsistent . Some lack year (Ref 7) , others contain a lot of co-authors ,



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

Please see journal style , usually after 6th author should be et al. 15. Are the references up-to-date and appropriate? Yes 16. Have the most important previous studies been cited?: Yes 17. Are the technical terms/compound names spelt correctly? Yes 18. Is the paper clearly written? Do the language, grammar and punctuation need significant improvement? It is clear written . 19. Does the paper leave any question in this particular field unanswered? No 20. Does it go beyond data summary and provide a wider perspective and insight into the topic? : No it collects known data. 21. Do the authors express their opinion or just they simply produce standard review of the field?: Yes they did. 22. Do you feel that the disclosure statement within the manuscript is fair and sufficient? Yes 23. Is there any conflict of interest?: NO



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19861

Title: Coronary physiology assessment in the catheterization laboratory

Reviewer's code: 01408945

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-05-26 15:32

Date reviewed: 2015-06-04 18:01

| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | | 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

Manuscript Number: 19861 Manuscript Title: CORONARY PHYSIOLOGY ASSESSMENT IN THE CATHETERIZATION LABORATORY Corresponding Author: Dr. Felipe Díez del Hoyo The review article seems to be well organized and conducted. However, there are some problems. The reviewer's critiques are as follows. Major criticism: 1. There are neither formulas nor equations in the text. 2. Authors should describe clearly contraindications of each examination. Minor criticism: 1. "Bibliography" is not suitable. Authors should use "references".