

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31063

Title: Inadvertent cardiac phlebography

Reviewer's code: 02638028

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2016-10-29 22:46

Date reviewed: 2017-01-01 23:43

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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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

This is a case report about the visualization of Thebesian veins. The figure was interesting, however its clinical implication remains small.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31063

Title: Inadvertent cardiac phlebography

Reviewer's code: 02454185

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2016-10-29 22:46

Date reviewed: 2017-01-02 07:08

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 checked="" 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 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

This is an interesting cause, but I have several comments: 1. A thorough review of literature is needed to provide a complete overview of the accident. What is the incidence rate? Can this incidence cause detrimental consequences? 2. It can be good to make a table listing all similar cases having been reported in the literature. 3. Some proposals of how to avoid this complication should be given. how can clinicians know the malposition of the catheter. 4. What's the difference between yours and the case of perforation (reference 6)? Because perforation is a major complication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 31063

Title: Inadvertent cardiac phlebography

Reviewer's code: 00214259

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2016-10-29 22:46

Date reviewed: 2016-11-06 05:37

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"/> 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		<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

This is a case report about an unexpected cardiac phlebography. The manuscript is well written and describes an important aspect related to the use of multipurpose radial catheters. It is important to stop injection if subendocardial staining or opacification of cardiac vein occur during ventriculogram. Also, I think that these events should support the common practice of not using radial multipurpose catheter with automated injector and with large contrast bolus or high PSI.