



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 66095

**Title:** Exercise stress echocardiography: Where are we now?

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05088164

**Position:** Associate Editor

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Romania

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-03-21 16:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-03-21 20:58

**Review time:** 4 Hours

<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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors of this review are presenting the role of exercise stress echocardiography, based on their methodology, in different situations. The title is presenting the main idea of the review... the current situation and possible use of this method. The abstract must be improved. The introduction of the review should present more data on the field. The manuscript titles may be noted with A, B, C and subtitles with 1,2,3 to have a more organized structure. Also, some paragraphs are too in detail with some repetition of information. The ethics and radiations risk could be separated into two chapters. There is no paragraph with conclusions of the review. The last paragraph are just the conclusions about the risk of radiation. The use of the English language seems to be correct and there is no need for corrections, just some typos. The review is based on a large number of important papers cited (126 titles) There are many figures (19) that illustrates the data presented in the review. Overall, the paper is well written, but needs to be more concentrated (condensed) and organized as it seems too long and the reader may lose the focus when reading.