

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 82781

Title: Fractional flow reserve and non-hyperemic indices: essential tools for percutaneous coronary interventions

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06368927

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor, FACC, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Senior Researcher, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-27

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-30 02:50

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-05 15:22

Review time: 6 Days and 12 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

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

I congratulate the authors for an exhaustive review on FFR and NHPR. There has been an adequate literature review on the topic with updated references included in the bibliography. However, the major concern I have is regarding the novelty of this manuscript. The facts that have been included are already known. I would like to see an integrative approach to yield newer applications. I want you to use your thought process and generate newer hypothesis/ the future of this technology in clinical practice. Besides this I would like the inclusion of QFR, which has come a big way and is challenging to replace FFR in cath lab in a few years time thanks to the obvious advantage. Discuss how QFR fairs compared to FFR and NHPR. You can add these studies and include in references:- 1) Westra J, Andersen BK, Campo G, Matsuo H, Koltowski L, Eftekhari A, Liu T, Di Serafino L, Di Girolamo D, Escaned J, Nef H. Diagnostic performance of in - procedure angiography - derived quantitative flow reserve compared to pressure - derived fractional flow reserve: the FAVOR II Europe - Japan study. Journal of the American Heart Association. 2018 Jul 17;7(14):e009603. 2) Kasinadhuni G, Batta A, Gawalkar AA, Budakoty S, Gupta A, Vijayvergiya R. Validity

and correlation of quantitative flow ratio with fractional flow reserve for assessment of intermediate coronary lesions. *Acta Cardiologica*. 2022 Apr 5:1-8. 3) Cortés C, Carrasco - Moraleja M, Aparisi A, Rodriguez - Gabella T, Campo A, Gutiérrez H, Julca F, Gómez I, San Román JA, Amat - Santos IJ. Quantitative flow ratio—Meta - analysis and systematic review. *Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions*. 2021 Apr 1;97(5):807-14.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 82781

Title: Fractional flow reserve and non-hyperemic indices: essential tools for percutaneous coronary interventions

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05516772

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-27

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-30 03:04

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-06 13:03

Review time: 7 Days and 9 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

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

The author introduced the mechanism, clinical use and significance of FFR and NHPR. The article is well organized. But it needs polish. 1. The author is suggested to discuss the difference or explain why IFR appears in the introduction part. Besides, NPHR and NHPR appear in the text, please correct. 2. The author introduce the definition of FFR, what about theoretical basis of iFR ? 3. The author said that "An hybrid approach to intermediate lesions (DFR 0.85 – 0.95) may be reasonable to maximize data available in clinical decision making and to facilitate appropriate revascularization strategies.' So, I suggested the author discuss the shortage of FFR and IFR, and discuss when to combine other assessment tools and the related clinical significance

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 82781

Title: Fractional flow reserve and non-hyperemic indices: essential tools for percutaneous coronary interventions

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06368927

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor, FACC, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Senior Researcher, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Belgium

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-27

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-24 13:15

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-24 13:21

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 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 checked="" 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

I am satisfied by the rebuttal of the authors and the changes they have incorporated in their manuscript. It now comprehensively covers the current concepts and evidence surrounding FFR and allied tools in clinical practice.