



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46932

**Title:** R/S ratio in lead II and the prognostic significance of red cell distribution width in acute coronary syndrome

**Reviewer’s code:** 02627104

**Reviewer’s country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-18 14:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-18 14:50

**Review time:** 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an interesting and accurate manuscript. It is well-written and provides useful information. There are only some very minor stylistic issues.



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

**INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46932

**Title:** R/S ratio in lead II and the prognostic significance of red cell distribution width in acute coronary syndrome

**Reviewer's code:** 00729408

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-18 01:23

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-19 12:20

**Review time:** 1 Day and 10 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Superb work.

**INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**



# Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242

**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

### *Google Search:*

The same title

Duplicate publication

Plagiarism

No

### *BPG Search:*

The same title

Duplicate publication

Plagiarism

No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46932

**Title:** R/S ratio in lead II and the prognostic significance of red cell distribution width in acute coronary syndrome

**Reviewer's code:** 02520738

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-21 17:40

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-24 15:36

**Review time:** 2 Days and 21 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

To: Editorial Board World Journal of Clinical Cases Title: "R/S Ratio in Lead II And the Prognostic Significance of Red Cell Distribution Width in Acute Coronary Syndrome"

Dear Editor, I read this manuscript and I think that: - The results section of the abstract is



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

poorly written. Please include more numerical data. - Decimals deserve dots rather than virgules. Please revise the entire manuscript. - Please revise the typos of the paper. For example, please revise the term “distrubition” into “distribution”. - The retrospective nature of this paper is a limitation of the study design. Please discuss such a point in a dedicated limitation section. - ALL of the clinical and biochemical characteristics of the study population should be included in table 1. As it stands, table 1 is very poor. - The clinical background about the relationship between ECG and RDW should be better expressed in relation to literature. - A multivariate regression analysis should be considered and should include all the characteristics of the study population, in order to evaluate the role of confounding factors on final results. - The role of diet and nutraceuticals on health should be considered. The authors can consider the paper from Scicchitano P et al Journal of Functional Foods 2014;6:11-32.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 46932

**Title:** R/S ratio in lead II and the prognostic significance of red cell distribution width in acute coronary syndrome

**Reviewer's code:** 02446694

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Ying Dou

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-03-22 22:05

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-03-30 06:55

**Review time:** 7 Days and 8 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors investigated the prognostic influence of R/S ratio in II leads and red cell distribution width (RDW) in patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS). This study included a lot of patients and seems to be unique, however, there are several problems to



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

be solved. #1 In the two groups based on the R/S ratio, the components of ACS were different. Thus, it seems to be difficult to compare the prognosis in 2 groups. Even in the ST elevation myocardial infarction, the prognosis is different between acute inferior infarction and acute anterior infarction. Thus, the authors should select each disease of ACS and compare the prognosis in 2 groups with the same category. #2 As stated in the "Limitation" sections, the medication such as statin and/or treatment such as percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) may affect the prognosis in ACS patients. Thus, the authors should provide such information. #3 The authors adopted the different prognostic markers: R/S ratio in II lead and RDW in the present study. However, it seemed that RDW was not so important prognostic marker. Thus, the authors should clarify the relationship between RDW and prognosis and should strengthen the impact of RDW in the present study.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No