

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 73324

Title: Bioinformatics prediction of potential mechanisms and biomarkers underlying

dilated cardiomyopathy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03478635 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Senior Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-15 06:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-17 04:18

Review time: 1 Day and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Baishideng Publishing

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

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study demonstrates the identification of the potential biomarkers in dilated cardiomyopathy. 2.4 Function enrichment analysis may be revised to describe that it is gene expression enrichment analysis. The results of GSEA analysis may be described more in detail.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 73324

Title: Bioinformatics prediction of potential mechanisms and biomarkers underlying

dilated cardiomyopathy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-14 03:44

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-25 07:53

Review time: 11 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng

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

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript ID: 73324 Manuscript Title: Identification of the potential biomarkers and mechanism in dilated cardiomyopathy via bioinformatic analysis Manuscript Type: Basic Study Journal: World Journal of Cardiology Major comments: The author appraised this paper by identifying the potential biomarkers and mechanism in dilated cardiomyopathy via bioinformatic analysis. However, your article is inadequately presented. Furthermore, there are many problems in the different sections as well. Although the article has scientific rigor, several major flows need to be improved before publication. 1. The abstract section is unsuitable — no focus point in the abstract section. 2. No aim found. 3. Rewrite the conclusion (in the abstract) in a more straightforward form. 4. Authors are suggested to use the full form when used for the first time throughout the manuscript. 5. 47 up-regulated and 50 down-regulated genes were screened out. Change this sentence. 6. The introduction section is poorly written. Authors are suggested to develop the introduction section by adding the literature related to cardiomyopathy (marked, risk factor, etc.). 7. The introduction section looks concise. Try to include the existing research limitations also, how the present research unravels those limits. 8. Need to arrange the introduction section logically – few updated references cited in this section. 9. Aim of the study need to write in the last paragraph of the introduction section. 10. Material and methods are written without proper references. Need a logical flow of the writings with enough references. 11. Need to write the website and access date for all the websites. 12. PPI network construction and hub genes identification: Why STING and Cytoscape? 13. Some tools used do not represent state of the art, and hence, the quality and confidence of the results may be limited. 14.



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Immune cells infiltration analysis: Need to add details. 15. Function enrichment analysis: Need to add details. 16. Many of the tools used are not cutting-edge or represent the best available tools. 17. The writing of results is good. Need to maintain a logical flow of the writings with the subtitles. 18. Many grammatically problematic sentences are in the results section, which must be checked and corrected precisely. 19. Figures presentation is up to mark. 20. Figure legends are self-explanatory. 21. The discussion is feeble. Please, include the data from other sources about related works. 22. A sound discussion includes principal, relationship, and generalizations supported by the results. 23. In the discussion, many concepts already reported in the introduction are repeated, so it is better to avoid unnecessary repetitions. 24. The conclusion needs to address future perspectives. 25. Novelty of the work should be added by the author in the conclusion section. 26. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript. 27. English is modest. The authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 73324

Title: Bioinformatics prediction of potential mechanisms and biomarkers underlying

dilated cardiomyopathy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03478635 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Senior Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-14

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-07 09:59

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-07 10:14

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has been revised according to the comments.