

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 67123

**Title:** ISCHEMIA trial: How to apply the results to clinical practice

**Reviewer's code:** 03846820

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACC, MD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-29 18:40

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-29 19:07

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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>

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear authors, The paper presents the Editorial with a focus on the clinical applications of the ISCHEMIA trial. The article is written with the acceptable English-speaking adduction of the arguments. The article is sufficiently novel and very interesting to warrant publication. All the key elements are presented and described clearly. The most discussable options in the article are: 1. I am generally satisfied by the content of the submitted article but would suggest elaborating on a few options. 2. Would you please avoid a slide style in the main text particularly when you are writing about key limitations of previous trials. 3. Is that possible to underline the role of CCTA in your schemes and how you offer the routine clinical practice to determine what is more preferable CCTA or ICA in figure 2? 4. I have a big question about kidney function when discussing contrast-associated interventions such as both CCTA and ICA. What are about G3b CKD? From ISCHEMIA trial we know very well higher rates of death and initiation of dialysis. The recommendations for such patients with chronic coronary syndrome especially in the group with GFR 30-44 are not obvious. 5. Ischemia testing - what do you exactly mean. I ask because there SPECT and CMR with a contrast as well. It becomes again critical for kidney function. Just imagine the story if by this scheme the patient should take three test including first CCTA, with indications CMR or SPECT and then if necessary ICA with possible PCI. All of these procedures are with a contrast. Please elaborate on it.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 67123

**Title:** ISCHEMIA trial: How to apply the results to clinical practice

**Reviewer's code:** 00227375

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Li Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-30 05:43

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-02 04:25

**Review time:** 1 Day and 22 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This editorial is nicely structured and well written. I have no question about this manuscript.