

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22066

**Title:** Collateral findings during computed tomography scan for atrial fibrillation ablation: Let's take a look around

**Reviewer's code:** 02446694

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-09-25 13:56

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-05 06:32

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 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 collateral findings during CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation. This review included representative cases at their institution and summary table about collateral findings during CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation. This review is well-written and seems to be interesting. I have one question as a reviewer. 1) CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation is not always familiar to the general cardiologists. Therefore, the authors had better provide information about the procedure of CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation. The CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation is the same of that for coronary artery disease, or includes any specific procedure for atrial fibrillation ablation. 2) In Figure 2 in the "Figure legends", there was a spelling mistake of "artery".

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22066

**Title:** Collateral findings during computed tomography scan for atrial fibrillation ablation: Let's take a look around

**Reviewer's code:** 00227375

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-09-25 13:56

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-28 21:01

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	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

This is an excellent review about the incidental findings detected by cardiac CT for AF catheter ablation. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. I have a few minor comments about this manuscript. Please consider the following comments. (Comments) 1. Page 11, line 13, I think the authors probably make a mistake. Reference seems to be "[42]", not "[41]". Sorry if I have got it wrong. 2. Table 1, Correct "Martins et al [33]" to "Martins et al [34]". Correct "Schietinger et al [34]" to "Schietinger et al [33]".

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22066

**Title:** Collateral findings during computed tomography scan for atrial fibrillation ablation: Let's take a look around

**Reviewer's code:** 02638028

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-09-25 13:57

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-26 22:23

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	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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 manuscript is a review about the collateral findings during CT scan for atrial fibrillation ablation. As authors mentioned, the optimal strategy to manage collateral findings should be considered and this manuscript help assessing the problem. However, collateral findings detected during CT scan for coronary artery disease is a similar problem and it should be discussed together within this manuscript. Is there any difference between collateral findings during CT scans for atrial fibrillation ablation and coronary artery disease?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22066

**Title:** Collateral findings during computed tomography scan for atrial fibrillation ablation: Let's take a look around

**Reviewer's code:** 00227470

**Reviewer's country:** Netherlands

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-24 20:24

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-24 22:07

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	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] 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 type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors wrote a short review article on how to deal with incidental findings on CT's performed in the work-up of EFO procedures. There is nothing very special/novel on this article, however, current data are well summarized. I do not have specific comments on how to improve the paper.