

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 39060

Title: Myocardial reperfusion injury and oxidative stress: Therapeutic opportunities

Reviewer's code: 02520738

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-28

Date reviewed: 2018-03-29

Review time: 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input 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 checked="" 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

To: Editorial Board World Journal of Cardiology Title: "Myocardial reperfusion injury and oxidative stress: therapeutic opportunities" Dear Editor, I read this manuscript and I think that: - Please revise the English of the text due to some typos. - The role of carotenoids in oxidative stress should be considered. Please consider and

discuss the paper from Ciccone MM et al. Mediators Inflamm. 2013;2013:782137. - Please include a table gathering the main findings from literature.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 39060

Title: Myocardial reperfusion injury and oxidative stress: Therapeutic opportunities

Reviewer's code: 00233953

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-28

Date reviewed: 2018-03-31

Review time: 3 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	(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

there are no specific comments

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:



**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

- ☐ 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: 39060

Title: Myocardial reperfusion injury and oxidative stress: Therapeutic opportunities

Reviewer's code: 02878348

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-28

Date reviewed: 2018-04-08

Review time: 10 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input 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

Summary and general comments This is a lengthy review on myocardial reperfusion injury (MRI), focusing on relevant mechanisms and the therapeutic use of anti-oxidants (e.g., ascorbate and N-acetylcysteine) and iron chelator (e.g., deferoxamine). As a whole, there is a lot of information presented in such a way that sometimes it is difficult to



**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

extract useful clinical findings from the lengthy text. Major comments 1. One of the major problems with reading the article as a whole is to differentiate between experimental and clinical findings. It would be much better if the authors could emphasize on the current clinical status by using “clinically’ or simply use a separate paragraph as “clinical highlights”. 2. The conclusion is a bit too long. The authors may consider incorporating the information into the main text and present only the most important points in Conclusion. 3. The idea of merging two images in Fig. 4 does not seem to be good one for the readers. Besides, the background wordings are not in English.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No