

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**Manuscript NO:** 64965

**Title:** The potential role of an athlete-focused echocardiogram in sports eligibility

**Reviewer's code:** 05209122

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Physiotherapist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-09 09:07

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-09 09:30

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Reviewer Comments    Thank you very much for the opportunity to review the manuscript submission entitled: The potential role of an athlete-focused echocardiogram in sports eligibility. The data is interesting, and it has a relevant rationale.    General comments: • The paper is technically sound. • The review is appropriate.    • The claims are appropriately discussed in the context of previous literature. • The manuscript is clearly written. • Please accept in the current form.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**Manuscript NO:** 64965

**Title:** The potential role of an athlete-focused echocardiogram in sports eligibility

**Reviewer's code:** 05038583

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-10 21:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-10 22:22

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

**General comments** This review article describes a pre-participation screening strategy with echocardiogram to prevent sudden cardiac death of an athlete. This is a well written review. This can be acceptable after addressing following comments. **Specific comments** Page 5 “Indeed, Niederseer et al. (21) proposed to include a double screening echocardiography in the athlete”: Please make reference consistent with other reference. As authors stated, POCUS is usually useful in quick assessment of cardiac function in the hospital settings, and this is operator dependent. Interpretation of echocardiography will probably require more training and should be interpreted by a cardiologist with expertise in interpretation. I feel, it would take a significant training period for non-cardiologist (such as sports medicine physician) to interpret POCUS results. Authors should use consistent term Black vs. Afro-American, etc. I feel it would be really difficult to assess anomalous origin of coronary arteries by echocardiography. What is the sensitivity compare to coronary CT scan or other methodologies? Some of the congenital heart diseases mentioned in the manuscript are usually diagnosed during early childhood, so unclear if this is relevant to this topic. Myocarditis, pericarditis, and Kawasaki disease is acute condition and not sure these are relevant to screening. These conditions usually manifest with other symptoms which will prompt more evaluation and athlete will probably not going to participate in athletic events.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**Manuscript NO:** 64965

**Title:** The potential role of an athlete-focused echocardiogram in sports eligibility

**Reviewer's code:** 05038583

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** Han Zhang (Online Science Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-17 15:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-17 15:40

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for letting me re-review your manuscript. As I stated in my initial peer

review, this is a well-written manuscript. The authors had addressed all the comments I pointed out. Unfortunately, after formatting by editors, changes in red were changed to black, so it was difficult for me to find out the exact location of changes, but I think this paper can be acceptable.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**Manuscript NO:** 64965

**Title:** The potential role of an athlete-focused echocardiogram in sports eligibility

**Reviewer's code:** 05209122

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Physiotherapist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

**Author's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** Han Zhang (Online Science Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-18 11:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-18 11:57

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No comments