

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31278

Title: Estimating pressure gradients by auscultation: How technology (echocardiography) can help improve clinical skills

Reviewer's code: 00227531

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-11-10 11:19

Date reviewed: 2017-03-01 02:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well-written and interesting paper demonstrating how clinical auscultation in expert hands may approximate echo results. The results are important in an era of considerable expenses in technology and of looking down on clinical examination. I have the following concerns: -I think that all exams were performed by a senior cardiologist with great experience. If so, please state it in the abstract. Also state the years of experience in the field. -The last exams showed better correlations with echo than the former ones, but it is not clear at which period of the study corresponds. Please state -It seems that all the patients had a clinical or echocardiographic diagnosis of a cardiac pathology instead of being "first" cases. Please state. Was the diagnosis of, saying, pulmonary stenosis of aortic stenosis, previously known?. In how many cases? -It seems that some of these data patients have been previously published (ref#15). Please state in how many of the patients it happens. -Please state in how many patients an echo exam could have been avoided according to the clinical examination. A discussion regarding this matter would add to the paper. -Introduction and discussion sections are a bit long. I suggest shortening them.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31278

Title: Estimating pressure gradients by auscultation: How technology (echocardiography) can help improve clinical skills

Reviewer's code: 02453249

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-11-10 11:19

Date reviewed: 2016-11-21 16:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Authors found in a large cohort of patients a high degree of accuracy of the physical examination against the benchmark Doppler echocardiography and discuss this clinical approach in the context of clinical practice, technology, and healthcare costs. As previously noted, listening to the heart with a stethoscope is cheap, quick and readily available. There are no echo parameters to detect an S3 heart sound, S4 heart sound, or to describe the intensity of heart sounds, so physical examination can detect some things that echo can't. Extensive data on comparing cardiac auscultation to echocardiography are lacking, thus this is one intriguing study, also if performed mainly in children and mostly in patients with PS, AS, or VSD. Conclusions and future directions are well stated.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31278

Title: Estimating pressure gradients by auscultation: How technology (echocardiography) can help improve clinical skills

Reviewer's code: 02446701

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-11-10 11:19

Date reviewed: 2017-02-26 10:14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

-