

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 80849

Title: Congenital absence of the right coronary artery: a case report of accidental discovery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06399745

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nepal

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-15 17:25

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-18 03:32

Review time: 2 Days and 10 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

1. Absence of a coronary artery can be classified by the famous "Lipton's Yamanaka classification of Single coronary artery (SCA)". Why did not you consider mentioning this on your report? Please check this article, "<https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.radcr.2022.08.089>" and consider mentioning the Lipton's type SCA that you found in CAG. This suggested article was prepared by me; you may or may not use this as one of the references if you wish to keep the classification. 2. This is an incidental finding I understand, so why don't you highlight this on your title someway? 3. In the last sentence of your Abstract's conclusion, I think a segment "...main means by which to diagnose..." is unnecessary and "...main means which diagnose..." is enough. 4. In the second sentence of second paragraph on discussion part where the mechanism of ST-T changes is being described, a segment "...relative lack of myocardium..." does not make sense. Should not it be something like, "...relative lack of myocardial supply..."?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 80849

Title: Congenital absence of the right coronary artery: a case report of accidental discovery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06310972

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-19 04:16

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-22 02:06

Review time: 2 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
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="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a case report of a patient in whom coronary angiogram led to be diagnosed as congenital absence of right coronary artery. Computed tomography coronary angiography was refused by the patient. This case report was written well, but has some aspects to be noted. 1: It will be better that the Video file contains the coronary angiogram showing the authors were struggling to identify the right coronary artery. The authors should show the Video file of Figure1B. 2: Usually, the severity of atherosclerotic changes is evaluated by CTCA or intravascular imaging (IVUS or CCT), not only by the CAG. What is the reason that the authors introduced the antiplatelets and statins in this patient?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 80849

Title: Congenital absence of the right coronary artery: a case report of accidental discovery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06399745

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Nepal

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-14

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-01 13:57

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-01 14:09

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Contribution to the literature should be continued. And, sharing rare cases like this makes difference in the future. Keep it up!