



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28401

**Title:** Newer perspectives of coronary artery disease in young

**Reviewer’s code:** 01593993

**Reviewer’s country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-01 18:51

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-18 18:36

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"/> 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 checked="" 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**

The authors reviewed the current perspectives of coronary artery disease in young (<45 years). Epidemiological trends were addressed as well as conventional and newly-identified risk factors. Finally, a section on prognosis is also included. Main comments: - The review is well written and the sections well identified. I believe it may be helpful for the reader to include a table with a summary of the classical and non-classical risk factors. - Pathophysiology (histology, pathology) of the CAD in young people should be specifically addressed in a dedicated paragraph. - Spontaneous dissection that typically affect young women is missing in this review. It is an important entity with specific pathophysiology that should be included. Minor issue: Check the rates of recurrent myocardial infarction reported in the text (89% and 96.6% at 5 years follow-up from -ref 61). It looks too high for me. This refers to survival free from MI. -Several references lack the year of publication: 61, 62. Please check.



# 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:** 28401

**Title:** Newer perspectives of coronary artery disease in young

**Reviewer's code:** 00106145

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-01 18:51

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-28 22:36

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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

The manuscript is very well written. The review appears exhaustive.



**ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28401

**Title:** Newer perspectives of coronary artery disease in young

**Reviewer's code:** 02744889

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-01 18:51

**Date reviewed:** 2016-08-03 01:54

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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**

In this review of Aggarwal et al. the epidemiology and the etiology of coronary heart disease of young people is represented. The subject of the review is of general interest. The manuscript is well written. However, I have some comments: "There are more than 180 risk factors found to be associated with CAD in younger people. Only few important and newer risk factors are Discussed in the review. "(Page 6) Here is missing a reference. By what criteria each other risk factors have been selected in this review? Why are these factors are important, especially for younger patients? A table of risk factors would be helpful. General: Are there any special diagnostic and therapeutic implications of the finding that coronary heart disease can also occur in young patients? Here a discussion would be advisable. Some minor errors: for example, arcus senalis (page 7)