Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited
Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Cardiology
ESPS Manuscript NO: 3802
Title: Coronary-cameral fistulas in adults: congenital types: Review (First of two parts)(part I)
Reviewer code: 00227648
Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling
Date sent for review: 2013-05-24 15:25
Date reviewed: 2013-05-29 21:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[Y] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[Y] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a case series of 11 cases of coronary-cameral fistulae confined to adult patients with a literature review. The paper is interesting but would benefit from some rewriting as some passages are incomplete sententences and/or difficult to follow. There is extensive literature on the embryology of these entities and the authors almost completely skip over that by excluding the pediatric literature on the subject which is extensive and rich. The manuscript could be improved by studying the pediatric literature but can also stand as it is. Specific comments: Page 2, abstract. Definition of macro fistulae is confusing. Why not say "large or small solitatary macro fistulae (cut-off 1.5 mm)" or something like that. Page 2, abstract, "apical..." hard to get the meaning of this phrase. Page 2, abstract - would be better if the authors STARTED out by saying "this is a case series and review of the literature adding 11 new cases" Page 4, line 8: the usual verbage is "y presented with disease x" and not the passive tense (i.e. was presented). Needs review by a native speaker to sort out grammar and vocabulary. Page 5, definitions: Should be rewritten as full phrases. "The definitions offered by... were applied" Page 8: Throughout the manuscript it is confusing why the authors add 11 new cases but chose to treat the macro fistula case differently. Shouldn't there be comments on 11 ECGs? Shouldn't case 11 show up in Table 1? Page 14: Hyphens or bullet points are not necessary here. Conclusion 2 belongs in results or should be significantly reworded. Table 1, column 1: Clumping together 3 parameters in the first column doesn't work. Confusing. Also, consider adding case 11 to Table 1. Table 2: Where are the references to the studies that are in this table?