

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Cardiology*

Manuscript NO: 88004

Title: Efficacy and prognostic impact of Pericarpium Trichosanthis injection combined with nicorandil for intractable angina pectoris in elderly patients: A retrospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02446043

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACC

Professional title: Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-05

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-26 08:22

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-03 12:41

Review time: 7 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a study comparing the addition of 2 drugs, Pericarpium Trichosanthis and Nicorandil, compared to a control group without the 2 drugs in the treatment of elderly patients with angina. The authors need to make some revisions to their paper in the manner data in Tables 2, 3 and 4 are presented: 1. "Comparison of Cardiac Function Levels Before and After Treatment: Before treatment, there were no statistically significant differences in LVEF, CO, BNP, CRP, and other indicators between the two groups ($P>0.05$). After treatment, compared with the control group, the study group had higher levels of LVEF and CO, and lower levels of BNP and CRP, with statistically significant differences ($P<0.05$) (Table 2)". This is not a good way of reporting results. There is a fall of BNP and CRP, and a rise in LVEF, and CO, in both the placebo and treatment groups. It is the difference namely the amount of fall in BNP, CRP and the amount of rise of LVEF, CO that is important. Is there a significant difference in the amount of fall or rise in the 4 parameters between the control and treated groups?? 2. "Evaluation of Angina Symptoms, Quality of Life, and Exercise Tolerance Before and After Treatment: Before treatment, there were no significant differences in CCS angina

classification, SQA scores, and 6MWT among the groups ($P>0.05$). After treatment, compared to the control group, the patients in the study group showed improvement in chest pain symptoms, with a significant decrease in CCS angina classification ($P<0.05$) and a significant improvement in 6MWT ($P<0.05$). However, the improvement in SQA scores was not significant (Table 3)". Again the comparison should be of the amount of change in the scores of each parameter. Is the amount of change in the scores before and after treatment different between the control and treated groups? 3. "Comparison of LDL, HDL, TC, TG levels before and after treatment in patients: There was no statistically significant difference in serum LDL, HDL, TC, and TG levels between the two groups before treatment ($p>0.05$). After 2 months of treatment, the study group showed a significant decrease in TC and TG levels compared to the control group, while LDL and HDL levels did not show significant changes ($P>0.01$) (Table 4)". Again there was a fall in TC, LDL-C and TG in both groups. Is the fall statistically different when the control group is compared to the treated group??