



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology
ESPS manuscript NO: 29459
Title: Cardiac biomarkers in pediatric heart disease: A state of art review
Reviewer's code: 00227594
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2016-08-16 18:01
Date reviewed: 2016-08-19 01:02

Table with 4 columns: CLASSIFICATION, LANGUAGE EVALUATION, SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT, CONCLUSION. It contains checkboxes for various review criteria like 'Grade A: Excellent', 'Priority publishing', 'Google Search', etc.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a worthwhile and timely review topic. the manuscript is generally well-written. This is a nice review. Major comments: -Length of the review for a subject with limited data is a bit long. I think it could be shortened by removing discussion related to adult studies, and just focus on pathophys of biomarker, followed by data in peds -It would be really helpful for the authors to use internal summaries after each biomarker to make it clear what the current state is in peds, and make specific recommendations for moving forward with each biomarker (as opposed to more general statements like we need more data). Or have a table that summarizes it. Specific comments: Abstract - typo - missing period in line 7 BNP - some parts have this but it would be useful to have actual #'s when it comes to statements such as "BNP can be used to differentiate preemies with and without a patent ductus arteriosus (PDA)"...what cut-offs were used, what sensitivity and specificity do they have....otherwise the practical application is difficult to gauge -should general age ranges be included in the discussion of sections? for example, the Kawasaki disease section vs transplant vs congenital...the age groups being talked about could be substantially different (helps the reader know what age groups there is data vs lacking) page 6 second last line - typo "health" instead of "healthy"



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>

Page 8, third last line - typo "our" instead of "are"



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: 29459

Title: Cardiac biomarkers in pediatric heart disease: A state of art review

Reviewer's code: 02446043

Reviewer's country: Malaysia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-08-16 18:01

Date reviewed: 2016-08-20 12:37

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

An interesting and well researched article that should be published. However authors can improve it by: 1. modifying the title to "biomarkers in paediatric heart disease" which is a more accurate reflection of what the article is about (instead of 'paediatric heart disease and biomarkers'). 2. including a table summarising the salient points of all the biomarkers mentioned.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29459

Title: Cardiac biomarkers in pediatric heart disease: A state of art review

Reviewer's code: 01955969

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-08-16 18:01

Date reviewed: 2016-08-26 22:59

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"/> 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 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

Reviewer's Code: 01955969 Manuscript Number 29459 4. Etiologically, pediatric heart failure is triggered and results from several causes, such as congenital heart disease, viral infections, and sarcomere protein gene mutation. Are these cardiac risk biomarkers altered in the same response pattern as the above-mentioned heart disease causes? A section discussing them would be interesting to add. 5. Although this review article is focused on pediatric heart failure, a few parts of the manuscript are not related. For example, there are 3 paragraphs describing "BNP and other disease" that is suggested to not be included in this paper. In addition, the majority of discussion was used to review BNP, whereas the descriptions of other biomarkers are not sufficient. More balance in these descriptions will make the manuscript relevant to more people.