

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17443

**Title:** Giant thrombosed left ventricular aneurysm

**Reviewer's code:** 00060493

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-07 20:19

**Date reviewed:** 2015-03-15 02:02

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 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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors report a case of left ventricle aneurysm. Echocardiography images are provided. This is a very well know pathology and the authors do not provide any other complementary imaging tool, like 3D CT and/or cardiac MRI. Contrast-echocardiography images may improve the pictures support and may improve the manuscript. - This reviewer do not understand why the authors have written at the end of their manuscript and under the sub-heading "Peer review" the statement "It is an excellent work. The manuscript is clearly written, well organized, comprehensive and appropriate referenced." This is a statement that have to be risen by the editorial. - It seems to this reviewer quite out of the guidelines considering, even for evaluation, that a 78 year-old patient is deemed for cardiac transplantation.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17443

**Title:** Giant thrombosed left ventricular aneurysm

**Reviewer's code:** 02633299

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-07 20:19

**Date reviewed:** 2015-03-08 06:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a interesting case and well described.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17443

**Title:** Giant thrombosed left ventricular aneurysm

**Reviewer's code:** 01198134

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-07 20:19

**Date reviewed:** 2015-03-09 08:28

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript by Agustin et al. is a case report. This manuscript was well-written. A weakness is the labelling of figures. The reviewer suggest authors to add arrows to indicate aneurysm, thormbus, occlusion and calcification. Inaddition, please add scale bar in all figures.