

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 38012

**Title:** Posterobasal left ventricular aneurysm after myocardial infarction with normal coronary arteries: case-report

**Reviewer's code:** 02446694

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Na Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2018-01-22

**Date reviewed:** 2018-01-31

**Review time:** 8 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

The authors reported a case of focal ventricular aneurysm with normal coronary artery. This case report seems to be interesting, however, there are several problems to be solved. #1 The authors put the a lot of previous reports into the "Introduction" section. The authors should move some parts of "Introduction" to the "Discussion" section. Thus, the authors should enhance the "Discussion" section. #2 The patient had chest symptoms due to her stress. It was possible that this symptoms were due to the occurrence of coronary spasm. Why did not the authors perform the spasm provocation test in the present case? The authors had better comment on this. #3 In Figures 4 and 5, the authors should take two figures together to one figure, such as Figure 4 A and B. In addition, in Figure 4, the trace line of left ventricle was wrong. I think that the trace line or arrows are not needed in the diastole image. #4 I think that the mention of

abdominal aortic aneurysm and figure 6 were not important in the case report. The authors had better delete them.