

We have read the review of the article with care and interest and we thank both the editor and the revisers for the high quality of the comments made, which we think have significantly helped improve the article's quality. We will now answer/comment upon the various aspects mentioned in the review:

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 67803

Title: Cardiac monitoring for patients with palpitations.

Reviewer's code: 05885746

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-30 21:03

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-31 02:50

Review time: 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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 paper reviewed the different ECG monitoring technology for patients with palpitations. 1. Please define ECG at the first time it appears in the introduction. 2. Some devices rely on algorithms to trigger records. The algorithms may have high type I/type II errors for some populations. Then, the recorded results may mislead physicians. To select a monitor device, physicians should also consider the accuracy of computer algorithms.

Author's answers:

First of all, thank you very much for your comments. We defined ECG the first time it appears in the introduction. We are in agreement with the reviewer that automatic algorithms are also one of the differences that can be considered when choosing a device. According to this recommendation, we added a specific paragraph to section 2.1 with this information.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 67803

Title: Cardiac monitoring for patients with palpitations.

Reviewer's code: 02457934

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor, Professor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-14 15:39

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-04 03:09

Review time: 20 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input 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

Some parts of the manuscript are too messy and cumbersome, and the central content is not prominent enough. May consider organizing the manuscript around the advantages and disadvantages of different ECG monitoring methods or their specificity and sensitivity in clinical researches.

Authors answers:

First of all, thank you very much for your comments. According to the reviewer's comments, some paragraphs and sentences have been modified to make reading easier. We agree with the reviewer that the advantages and disadvantages of different ECG monitoring methods or their specificity and sensitivity in clinical research are key points. This information is mostly reported in section 2.2 in the text. However, to make it clearer and easier to find for readers, we included table 2 with the main advantages and disadvantages and table 3 with the most relevant studies and their diagnostic yield. We think that also including a section with the different classification characteristics and a section with some tips on the work-up to manage these patients will be also interesting for readers. We consider that this article not only provides an update about this topic, but also introduces some other aspects in the review that differentiate it from other reviews published some years ago.

SCIENCE EDITOR

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a review of the cardiac monitoring for patients with palpitations. The topic is within the scope of the WJC. (1) Classification: Grade B and Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: There are some problems in the manuscript that need to be revised and explained. Define the ECG when it first appears in the introduction; some parts of the manuscript are too messy and cumbersome, and the central content is not prominent enough. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are 3 tables and 4 figures; (4) References: A total of 99 references are cited, including 30 references published in the last 3 years; and (5) Self-cited references: There are 4 self-cited reference. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors need to provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJC. 5 Issues raised: (1) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the Figures cited in the original manuscript in the form of PPT. All text can be edited, including A, B, arrows, etc. With respect to the reference to the Figure, determine if it is the original Figure, if not, please provide the source of the picture and the proof that the Figure has been authorized by the previous publisher or copyright owner to allow it to be redistributed.; (2) References 60 and 62 are duplicated, 84 and 91 are duplicated, please modify, and cite the references in order; (3) There are less than 100 references, so you need to modify the manuscript type to Minireviews; and (4) Please write the "Conclusion" section at the end of the main text. 6 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

Authors answers:

We inform you that all figures are original. We provide the figures cited in the manuscript also in editable PPT format. References have been updated. After the revision, there are 104 references, meeting the criteria for manuscript type of "review". We also include a "Conclusion" section at the end of the main text.



**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>

We confirm that this paper is original and has not been published by any other journal, and nor is it being considered for publication elsewhere. We also inform you that the manuscript has been translated and reviewed by a professional native English-speaking translator.