

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68077

Title: Application of ultrasonography in the assessment of cardiac function and disease severity in patients with coronary heart disease

Reviewer's code: 06081572

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-07 07:42

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-09 01:58

Review time: 1 Day and 18 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you very much for asking me to review this manuscript by Jing-Fang Zhang et al. This is a retrospective study to evaluate the value of ultrasonography in the evaluation of cardiac function and lesion degree in patients with CHD. The result of the study is of interest and may help evaluate the status and prognosis of heart disease and provide an objective reference for diagnosis and treatment. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English. The number of participants in the study is large enough. Furthermore, minor comment that I would to proposed: 1. Title: Proper and cover all the core result from the study. 2. Abstract: Address all of the important component from the study. However, I recommend that only the critical data be presented in the Results section and that other secondary results be described in words. 3. Key words: could cover this study. 4. Introduction: Describe the overall basic knowledge for this study. Moreover, the aim of the study is clear. 5. Method: The present study is methodologically well conducted. 6. Results: The result of this study is of interest. 7. Discussion: The manuscript clearly interprets the finding adequately and appropriately. In addition, the manuscript could highlight the key points clearly. The previous significant paper involved were included in the discussion, I suggest discussing more in this aspect in the discussion part. 8. Tables: I congratulate the authors for the captions to the tables very explicative and complete.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68077

Title: Application of ultrasonography in the assessment of cardiac function and disease severity in patients with coronary heart disease

Reviewer's code: 06081512

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-07 07:43

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-10 00:57

Review time: 2 Days and 17 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 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="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, thank you for submitting your paper to the World Journal of Clinical Cases. In your retrospective study, a total of 106 patients with CHD were selected as the study group and 106 healthy subjects as the control group. All the subjects were examined by ultrasound, and the ultrasonic parameters of the two groups and the correlation between the ultrasonic parameters of the patients with different cardiac function grades and the degree of CHD and the degree of CHD were calculated. The prognosis was counted and the ultrasonic parameters of patients with different prognosis were compared after follow-up for 6 mo. Finally you found the ultrasonographic parameters of patients with CHD are abnormal, and they are significantly different in patients with different cardiac function grades, lesion degrees and prognosis. Your study is a well-written, good structured recommendation for the evaluate and prognosis of heart disease. Introduction give a good overview about the study background and the authors raised clearly the hypothesis of the study. The description of material studied is accurate. The aim of the study is fulfilled. The material studied is large enough and allows to draw the conclusions. The Results are presented clearly and have been discussed well. All recommendations are good for clinical use. Thank you for a useful and important synopsis of this important topic.