

### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 76669

**Title:** 30-day readmission in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction:

Insights from the Nationwide Readmission Database.

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06264110 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-26 01:43

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-08 00:57

**Review time:** 12 Days and 23 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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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 [ 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	[ ]Yes [Y]No



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

Abstract and key words are needed to summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript 2. The explanation of the research purpose in the background exposition needs to be more detailed and specific.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 76669

**Title:** 30-day readmission in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction:

Insights from the Nationwide Readmission Database.

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited 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: 2022-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-16 05:09

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-16 05:21

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] 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) [ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



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

Dear author, The article represents the results of a retrospective study with obscure objective. The article is written with the acceptable 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) Please correct all your multiple grammar errors and typos. 2) The statistical power must be properly comprehensively characterized. You must start with a clear definition of your study design. Please, explain the nature of your database. The population must be characterized. The options of statistical power, bias must be emphasized. 3) I have failed to find out the objective of your study. Your Introduction must play a role of the justification for your objective which should be at the end of the Introduction. Your abstract does not have neither objective nor conclusion. 4) You must provide the clinical definitions for all clinical conditions that were involved in the study. How diagnosis was made must be explained. Frankly, you do not have even a definition for HFpEF. 5) Would you please kindly elaborate on your Limitations? 6) Do you think there is room for plots and more sophisticated analysis? 7) The database looks interesting but your analysis is too superficial without in-depth understanding of the population that you have analyzed. This is a very major concern that must be addressed.



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 76669

**Title:** 30-day readmission in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction:

Insights from the Nationwide Readmission Database.

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05227810 **Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACC, FESC, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-22 19:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-23 07:28

**Review time:** 11 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 [ 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



https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements

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

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have well described the short term outcomes of HF with preserved EF form a large retrospective database. It would have been excellent to see the impact of Medications on short term outcomes as noted by authors in limitation. Few minor comments are noted - 1. There is no stirred abstract-Please provide one. 2. Why individual comorbidites like anemia, CAD etc. were not taken into account while calculating independent predictors of 30 day readmission. 3. Please provide reference for Charlson comorbidity index. 4. The reference format need to be changed. 5. Few grammatical errors - "Portrends" need correction. 6. "Combining all cardiac readmission etiologies our study found about 26.3% readmissions were due to cardiac etiologies." - please explain.



### RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 76669

**Title:** 30-day readmission in patients with heart failure with preserved ejection fraction:

Insights from the Nationwide Readmission Database.

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited 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: 2022-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-24 16:10

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-24 16:45

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	[ ] 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous



statements

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

# SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

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