ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology
ESPS manuscript NO: 32277
Title: Cardiac and Pericardial Tumors: A potential application of PET-MRI
Reviewer's code: 02446706
Reviewer's country: Netherlands
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2016-12-31
Date reviewed: 2017-01-04

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[ ] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ ] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This attempt to describe the new modality of PET-MRI in diagnosing cardiac and pericardial tumors is promising. But special attention should be paid to the spelling and type setting through out the manuscript.

Thank you very much for this comment, the entire manuscript has been edited with special attention to spelling and typing.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology
ESPS manuscript NO: 32277
Title: Cardiac and Pericardial Tumors: A potential application of PET-MRI
Reviewer's code: 03345188
Reviewer's country: Netherlands
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2017-03-20
Date reviewed: 2017-03-20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[ ] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ ] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author prepared a nice overview of the (preliminary) application of PET-MRI in the evaluation of cardiac tumours. These scanners are currently not widely available across the globe, even in developed countries. However, the technique looks promising and the author demonstrates the value in a short review and description of some clinical cases. Besides the fact that language editing is necessary (preferably performed by a native speaker), I donot have specific comments.

Thank you very much; the manuscript has been edited very thoroughly.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology
ESPS manuscript NO: 32277
Title: Cardiac and Pericardial Tumors: A potential application of PET-MRI
Reviewer's code: 01264608
Reviewer's country: $[ReviewerCountry]
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2017-03-20
Date reviewed: 2017-03-23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[ ] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ ] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review manuscript addressed the significance of cardiac and pericardiac tumors assessed by PET-MRI. This manuscript well summarized the clinical scenario encountered during the clinical practice. There are several points to be revised before publication. 1)Please correct typo errors. For example, page1/ line23 (PT-MRI →PET-MRI), page3/ line20 (pet→PET), page 4/ line2 (asses→assesses), page5 line15 and 25 (artefact or artifact, please keep the consistency), page 8/line21 (pet→PET) etc. 2)Before using abbreviation authors should describe. Page4; M staging, page4/line24; PM (what do they stand for?), page 7/line21-21; ADC and DW (what do they stand for?) 3) The description of each figure is too brief. Should describe more detail in the main sentence.

Thank you for your comment, all these abbreviation has been changed and we add a title to each figure.