

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 68268

Title: Untangle among the difficult interplay between ischemic and hemorrhagic risk:

The role of risk scores

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03846820 Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACC, FESC, MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Doctor

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

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

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-01 03:41

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-01 04:35

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes [ ]No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, The paper represents the review article which is focused on the interplay between ischemic and hemorrhagic risk scores. 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. Would you please kindly correct all your typos and grammar errors throughout the manuscript. 2. It looks like a systematic review. Please provide a reader with the objective and limitations. The Methods might be elaborated on. 3. Please reorganize your final paragraph with the separated summary and Conclusion. You have a pretty good Systematic review, and I would recommend you provide more relevant information.