

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 39148

Title: Accuracy of myocardial viability imaging by cardiac MRI and PET depending on left ventricular function

Reviewer's code: 02634762

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-29

Date reviewed: 2018-04-11

Review time: 12 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors compared LGE of CMR and FDG-PET uptake in patients with known obstructive CAD. They found that segments with scar was more frequent in patients with EF <30%, while it was less frequent in patients with EF >50%. Please see the



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

comments. Major comments 1. The authors compared the CMR viability scores with PET scores by changing the thresholds for viability in CMR. However, in the Results, the authors mention "prediction of functional recovery". This phrase is very confusing because prediction of functional recovery is only possible when observation is performed. The authors did not perform a longitudinal observation. This study was a cross-sectional study. The authors should change this phrase as "prediction of viability by PET". 2. In the Core tip section, the authors state that PET might overestimate the functional outcome. The phrase overestimate is difficult to understand, because "overestimate" can be used as either worse or better. Please clarify. Minor comments 1. Why did the authors evaluate the LGE extent for each slice of MRI rather than using the 17-segment model of AHA? 2. Please provide the Kappa value for the interobserver difference in the diagnosis of viability scores. 3. Please provide the viability score in Fig 2.

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 Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 39148

Title: Accuracy of myocardial viability imaging by cardiac MRI and PET depending on left ventricular function

Reviewer's code: 02497043

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-03-29

Date reviewed: 2018-04-11

Review time: 12 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is quite comprehensive and potentially important. The first time in this research, the comparison between CMR and PET differentiated in groups depending on LVEF have been investigated. Investigators have demonstrated that CMR is good in



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https:// www.wjgnet.com

detecting myocardial scars. It is also important that CMR might prevent from unnecessary invasive procedures and potential peri-interventional risks.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No