

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20177

Title: Population-level differences in revascularization treatment and outcomes among various United States subpopulations

Reviewer's code: 00227375

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-05-31 16:52

Date reviewed: 2015-07-23 21:19

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a review about disparities of race, gender, and co-morbidities in cardiac revascularization treatment and outcomes. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. However, I have one minor comment about this manuscript. Please consider the following comment. (Comment) It is thought that reference 7 is quoted in neither of the text or tables. Sorry if I have got it wrong.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20177

Title: Population-level differences in revascularization treatment and outcomes among various United States subpopulations

Reviewer's code: 00225292

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-05-31 16:52

Date reviewed: 2015-07-30 19:26

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"/> 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 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

The Paper describes the racial and gender cardiovascular disparities i, as well as the most recent upto date review of disparities in co-morbidities. It is an interesting investigation.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20177

Title: Population-level differences in revascularization treatment and outcomes among various United States subpopulations

Reviewer's code: 00009417

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-05-31 16:52

Date reviewed: 2015-06-27 00:04

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

The interesting review summarizes data about population-level differences in revascularization treatment and outcome among various U.S. subpopulations. The important finding that disparities among younger female patients concerning cardiovascular disease and therapy exist is communicated. Comments The Core Tip includes not the essentials and should be re-written. The statement should be given that U.S. subpopulations are analyzed. In the Abstract, this information should be additionally given. Anti-baby pill and orally applied hormones should be reviewed and discussed as additional reason for worse women outcome. Page 4; last paragraph: The statement - "Women frequently have more co-morbidities associated with CVD than men." - is in a general way and should be omitted. In the following sentences and paragraphs a more heterogeneous view is given; this should be addressed. The conclusions should be re-written in a more precise way. Data for U.S. should be separated from more general findings. For better understanding, the review should be shortened.