

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17153

Title: Intra-His bundle block in 2:1 atrioventricular block

Reviewer's code: 00039411

Reviewer's country: Argentina

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-02-22 18:53

Date reviewed: 2015-03-21 03:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It's an interesting case report. I suggest that: In paragraph Number 1 (page 3), After "Introduction": It is better to begin a phrase with some word, not numbers. So instead of "(EPS). 2:1 atrioventricular..." I suggest something like "(EPS); 2:1 atrioventricular" or "(EPS). Type 2:1..." In page Number 3, when you report that a "narrow QRS complex and right bundle branch block": if the QRS is narrow so probably the bundle branch block is incomplete, it should be specified that. In page 8, Figure 1 (legend). When you describe the 3 images, you should add "A" after the legend "The surface ECG shows 2:1 atrioventricular block with right bundle branch block. A: The intracardiac..." (you only mention figures B and C in the legend)

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17153

Title: Intra-His bundle block in 2:1 atrioventricular block

Reviewer's code: 02639698

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-02-22 18:53

Date reviewed: 2015-03-14 22:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is an interesting well written case report

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 17153

Title: Intra-His bundle block in 2:1 atrioventricular block

Reviewer's code: 00236910

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-02-22 18:53

Date reviewed: 2015-03-13 06:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> [] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Many thanks for the opportunity to review your work. This case report is interesting but I wonder whether the authors can generalise whether this case was due to only this particular situation (or catheter) or a certain brand of the catheter or this is more likely to be a generic problem.