

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12812

Title: The role of coronary physiology in the contemporary management of coronary artery disease

Reviewer code: 00735706

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-07-27 23:03

Date reviewed: 2014-09-05 06:24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Overall the article is highly relevant, timely and well written. 2. The value of the article is likely to be enhanced if the available data on the different methods in terms their usage in different coronary laboratories in the World - developed and developing counties. 3. The limitations of these modern measures, if any need to be highlighted. 4. The cost of the techniques and automation in obtaining the results may also be mentioned. 5. The need and possible incorporation of these into medical curriculum at various levels also could be highlighted. 6. Tables and figures can be added to compare the techniques and flowchart.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12812

Title: The role of coronary physiology in the contemporary management of coronary artery disease

Reviewer code: 02446694

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-07-27 23:03

Date reviewed: 2014-08-05 03:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reviewed the role of coronary physiology in the contemporary management of coronary artery disease. This review seems to be well-written and educative. I raised two request as a reviewer.

1) In the "IMR" paragraph, the authors had better provide the normal values and abnormal values (or cut-off values) in the clinical settings. 2) In this review, there were no figures or tables. Thus, the authors had better add a figure of representative case, in which coronary physiology was very useful in the management of coronary artery disease. In addition, the authors had better add a table showing the advantages and disadvantages of FFR, CFR and IMR.