

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 80606

**Title:** Development and refinement of diagnostic and therapeutic strategies for managing patients with cardiogenic stroke: An arduous journey

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00504462

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** AGAF, FACC, FACP, MD

**Professional title:** Associate Specialist, N/A

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-27 23:57

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-02 16:29

**Review time:** 5 Days and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Sir, I want to congratulate your manuscript, it is a nice small revision regarding this special topic. And it is clear that there are several grey areas that need to be evaluated. However, how does your proposal would change the natural history of the disease? For instance, you "propose that the classification of AAA-related strokes as LAA subtypes can reflect its exact pathogenesis, but it is more appropriate to attribute it to cardiogenic strokes", how does this change would give us an opportunity area in prevention or treatment? Do you consider to give a different type of antocoagulants for each phase of the disease? How it should be monitored, in relation to other etiologies of stroke that need anticoagulation treatment? Do you consider any changes to the long term follow up into these discussion? Do you consider any general recommendations that need to be stated to GP and IM physicians when dealing with patients with a cardiac condition? Hope these suggestions could help to add more value to your unquestionable effort and value. Sincerely

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 80606

**Title:** Development and refinement of diagnostic and therapeutic strategies for managing patients with cardiogenic stroke: An arduous journey

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05429012

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-11-26 21:51

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-05 13:22

**Review time:** 8 Days and 15 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the authors discussed a very important topic. the following points need to be clarified: - Is the figure provided in the manuscript made by the the authors or taken from other source. please make this clear. if taken from another source, mention that. - After the large discussion of the topic, I wish to have clear picture of the author's opinion on the topic in erms of creating guidlines or similar issues.