



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25626

**Title:** Thoracic ultrasound: A complementary diagnostic tool in cardiology

**Reviewer’s code:** 00227531

**Reviewer’s country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-19 15:09

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-20 04:50

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 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**

This is a well-written state of the art paper on a not very-well known technique such as thoracic ultrasound, presented by a recognized expert on this issue. I have just some recommendations to increase the interest of this manuscript for the readership -Some figures will increase the appeal of this paper. I suggest including at least a case of consolidation (like atelectasia or neoplasia), a case of both pleural and pericardial effusion, a case of pneumothorax, a figure of a patient with B lines, and another showing how TUS can guide an intervention. -The issue of the inferiority of TUS as compared with echocardiography is kind of repetitive through the manuscript. I would delete some sentences about this matter. -The history of TUS appears at the end of the manuscript. I think it would be better to have it at the beginning of it. -More information about the kind of machines and transducer needed for these studies would also increase the interest of the paper



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25626

**Title:** Thoracic ultrasound: A complementary diagnostic tool in cardiology

**Reviewer’s code:** 00225356

**Reviewer’s country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-19 15:09

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-28 16:56

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		<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**

The editorial by dr. Trovato is a very good review paper on the usefulness of thoracic ultrasounds, which should be considered by the cardiologist for the diagnosis of the diseases of the lung, pleura, and heart. Only a couple of comments to improve further the quality of the manuscript. 1. Some of the content of the paragraph “The rationale and the procedure..” can be summarized and presented in one or more tables. This could result in a more attractive presentation for the readership. 2. Adding some ultrasounds pictures of peculiar conditions will greatly increase the impact of the manuscript. For example, the author mentions the usefulness of thoracic ultrasounds in the diagnosis of pneumothorax and in the differential diagnosis of pleural vs. pericardial effusion. Imaging of this will be very much appreciated.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25626

**Title:** Thoracic ultrasound: A complementary diagnostic tool in cardiology

**Reviewer's code:** 00276417

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-19 15:09

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-01 06:58

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

This is a review of a life-time experience with the technique. However, I have never come across an editorial that went far beyond 2 pages. I would strongly urge the author to summarise the manuscript into a more readable summary



# 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

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 25626

**Title:** Thoracic ultrasound: A complementary diagnostic tool in cardiology

**Reviewer's code:** 00227651

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Shui Qiu

**Date sent for review:** 2016-03-19 15:09

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-31 12:38

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"/> [ Y] 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"/> [ ] 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"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade E: Poor		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"/> [ Y] No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a concise and well written mini-review which will be met with interest by pulmonary and general medicine specialists. I would recommend to change titles of first two sections, just to make them more suitable for a scientific journal(i.e. "A journey..." and "What, who...").