

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 67037

Title: Comparative efficacy and safety of adenosine and regadenoson for assessment of

fractional flow reserve: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03846820

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACC, FESC, MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-13

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-30 13:55

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-31 16:27

**Review time:** 1 Day and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, Dear authors, The paper represents the results of the systematic review and meta-analysis focused on comparative efficacy and safety of adenosine and regadenoson for assessment of fractional flow reserve. The article is written with the good English-speaking adduction of the arguments. The article is sufficiently novel and very interesting to warrant publication. All the key elements are presented and described clearly. The most discussable options in the article are: 1) Would you please kindly correct all your typos and grammar errors throughout the manuscript. 2) The objective of the meta-analysis is missing at the end of Introduction. 3) The statistical power must be clearly provided. 4) The bias should be characterized.



## **RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology Manuscript NO: 67037 Title: Comparative efficacy and safety of adenosine and regadenoson for assessment of fractional flow reserve: A systematic review and meta-analysis Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind **Reviewer's code:** 03846820 **Position:** Editorial Board Academic degree: FACC, FESC, MD Professional title: Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Doctor Reviewer's Country/Territory: Netherlands Author's Country/Territory: United States Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-13 **Reviewer chosen by:** Jing-Jie Wang (Online Science Editor) Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-15 15:05 Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-15 16:26

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] 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	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous





statements

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, Thank you for your substantial efforts to improve the article.