

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18233

Title: Challenging aspects of treatment strategies in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction - "Why did recent clinical trials fail?"

Reviewer's code: 00211908

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-04-18 17:22

Date reviewed: 2015-04-24 04:48

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 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 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

Hengelo, 22 April 2015 Comments on the ESPS Manuscript NO: 18233 With the title: "Challenging aspects of treatment strategies in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction - "Why did recent clinical trials fail?" written by Becher PM, Fluschnik N, Blankenberg S and Westermann D. - This manuscript gives an excellent and detailed exposition on the performed and current trials and studies related to HFpEF. - It conveys a strong message for future trials directions and set-up and sheds light on how the future trials should be designed and conducted. Page 6: Line 10: Please consider "with" instead of "witch". Page 6: Line 19: Please consider "absent" instead of "absence". Page 7: Line 6: Please consider adding "of" between effects and beta-blockers ---. Page 10: Line 21: Please consider changing "syndrome" to "symptom". Page 13: Line 18: Please consider omitting the sentence starting with " In this trial the conducted population" Page 16: Line 22: Please consider altering "did not displayed" to "did not display". Page 31: Line 9: Please consider adding "c" to "shema" to become "scheme". References should be displayed according to the requirements of the journal. With best regards, Number ID: 00211908

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18233

Title: Challenging aspects of treatment strategies in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction - "Why did recent clinical trials fail?"

Reviewer's code: 00009616

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-04-18 17:22

Date reviewed: 2015-05-05 09:09

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written and analysed review. Accept as it is.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18233

Title: Challenging aspects of treatment strategies in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction - "Why did recent clinical trials fail?"

Reviewer's code: 00227594

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-04-18 17:22

Date reviewed: 2015-05-06 14:38

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		[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 is a pertinent review of a topic that continues to evolve. However, the authors have done a nice job assembling content that is currently up to date. Some grammatical editing is required but otherwise most comments should only require minor editing or additions. Throughout manuscript - please re-format for proper paragraphs. There are so many isolated sentences and short paragraphs that should be combined. Nebivolol - nebivolol itself would possibly confer additional benefits due to the NO enhancing action of the drug...suggest adding or discussing this mechanism BB summary (just before ref 18) - "absence" should be "absent"; "carefully" should be "careful" ACEi - mechanism for potential benefit is afterload reduction and reduced wall tension, leading to improved diastolic function (hemodynamic effects on ventricular function have not been included in any of the drug class discussions)...suggest adding PEP-CHF - beneficial effect seen early was lost by end of the study (authors only mention the 1y results) CHARM-P - authors should point out that this was not a true HFpEF population (LVEF cut off 40%, and diastolic fx not assessed) ALDO-HF - more detail to be more consistent with other study discussions? DIG Ancillary - 4th sentence, "o"



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

should be "to"; should be mentioned at there was an early benefit with digoxin (as with PEP-CHF) that was lost by the end of follow-up LCZ696 - why was PARADIGM-HF discussed, it does not relate to the topic of HFpEF (should also be removed from the table)

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 18233

Title: Challenging aspects of treatment strategies in heart failure with preserved ejection fraction - "Why did recent clinical trials fail?"

Reviewer's code: 00214259

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-04-18 17:22

Date reviewed: 2015-04-19 09:19

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good review about preserved HF. Pages numbers should be added. In the ALDO-HF trial, treatment with mineralocorticoid-receptor antagonists decreases renal function. Section about Phosphodiesterase-5 inhibition should be reviewed. Subtitles should be added in many sections. The second part of the summary should be reviewed. That paragraph with focus on LCZ696 is not supported by the preceding argumentation.