

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 65124

Title: RADIATION PROTECTION FOR THE INTERVENTIONAL CARDIOLOGIST.
PRACTICAL APPROACH AND INNOVATIONS

Reviewer's code: 05242485

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-20 00:21

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-28 02:28

Review time: 8 Days and 2 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nice review on radiation protection for interventional cardiology. I think what is missing is a summary of regulatory limit on occupational radiation exposure and the current status with respect to the limit. Minor issues follows: 1) c. Technical approach: "try to be avoided" remove "try to"; 2) "extreme angulations are associated with high air kerma values" please provide reference; 3) "Most modern systems have software magnification": Should point out that software magnification does not add clinical information. Hardware magnification should still be used when clinically indicated. 4) Decreasing frame rate to 7.5 fps "has been shown to result in significant radiation dose reduction": Is there a reference of is it simply scaling down the radiation exposure? 5) "about half" -> "about a half"; 6) "childhood risk of cancer" -> "risk of childhood cancer"; 7) "In addition also having an additional dosimeter...": Check grammar / complete the sentence; 8) INNOVATIONS: "new concepts... are being" -> "new concepts... were being"; 9) "resulting from routinely wearing heavy protective apparel" -> "resulted from..."; 10) "have demonstrated" -> "have been demonstrated"; "has proven" -> "has been proven"; 11) Check section tags. Should "Robotic percutaneous systems" be "d" and "Others" be "e"? 12) "vailable"->"available"? 13) "A recently study" -> "A recent study"; 14) "a FDA black box warning" -> "an..."; 15) "proportionally with" -> "proportionally to"; 16) "one of the basic principles of..." -> "one of the basic components of..."? 17) Figure 6 caption: "extended reach" -> "extended-reach". What is "corthpack"?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 65124

Title: RADIATION PROTECTION FOR THE INTERVENTIONAL CARDIOLOGIST.
PRACTICAL APPROACH AND INNOVATIONS

Reviewer's code: 05925565

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-25 15:55

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-03 13:04

Review time: 7 Days and 21 Hours

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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting title and well-written review article. My suggestion is to reorder subheadings and to put the "PREGNANCY" part at the relatively latter of the article.