

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8475

Title: Immediate Coronary Invasive Strategy in Patients with Resuscitated Sudden Cardiac Arrest and STEMI

Reviewer code: 02633299

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-12-28 21:42

Date reviewed: 2013-12-31 18:38

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review manuscript is very interesting and actual debate concerning the indications to coronary angiography in patients with cardiac events. According my opinion, the cardiac catheterization with coronary angiography should be performed in those patients with cardiac events. This is essential in all conscious and unconscious patients with STEMI.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8475

Title: Immediate Coronary Invasive Strategy in Patients with Resuscitated Sudden Cardiac Arrest and STEMI

Reviewer code: 02516081

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-12-28 21:42

Date reviewed: 2014-01-01 10:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Reviewer's comments It is difficult to conduct a prospective randomized clinical trial of the treatment for patients with STEMI in postresuscitation, because there is not a moment to lose in such a situation and the leader of a team for emergency should decide the strategy those patients who are faced with a life-threatening situation. The present manuscript cited 40 reports about the strategy for the patients with STEMI in postresuscitation, which is interesting and will be very valuable in the clinical setting. However this reviewer needs additional information. Major 1. Please add in the table 1, time from cardiac arrest to start of resuscitation or percentage of bystander resuscitation. Minor 1. p. 3, line 13, "angiography"; please correct its spelling. 2. p. 3, line 26-28, "There is also recent meta analysis of 10 observational studies showing immediate invasive coronary strategy to as independent predictor of survival (OR 2.78; 95% CI 1.89-4.10; p<0.001) (49)." The reference number "49" is next to "8". Please correct. 3. p. 4, line 19-21, "Nowadays, there is a question whether we should base our revascularization strategy for patients with STEMI in postresuscitation ECG on on non-randomized observational cohort studies." Please correct two words underlined.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8475

Title: Immediate Coronary Invasive Strategy in Patients with Resuscitated Sudden Cardiac Arrest and STEMI

Reviewer code: 02748168

Science editor: Gou, Su-Xin

Date sent for review: 2013-12-28 21:42

Date reviewed: 2014-01-09 05:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think that this a very important thema but this review is too small. The publications should be more extensiv discussed. If you make a statement, you should mentioned the relative publications.