

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

ANSWERING REVIEWER

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 68268

Title: Untangle among the difficult interplay between ischemic and hemorrhagic risk:

the role of risk scores

Reviewer's code: 03846820

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACC, MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Netherlands

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-01 03:41

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-01 04:35

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, The paper represents the review article which is focused on the interplay between ischemic and hemorrhagic risk scores. The article is written with the acceptable English-speaking adduction of the arguments. The article is sufficiently novel and very interesting to warrant publication. All the key elements are presented and described clearly. The most discussable options in the article are: 1. Would you please kindly correct all your typos and grammar errors throughout the manuscript. 2. It looks like a systematic review. Please provide a reader with the objective and limitations. The Methods might be elaborated on. 3. Please reorganize your final paragraph with the separated summary and Conclusion. You have a pretty good Systematic review, and I would recommend you provide more relevant information.

ANSWER

Thank you for your consideration. We appreciate the constructive comments of the Reviewer which allowed us to improve the quality of our manuscript. We were able to address the majority of the Reviewers' enquiries. Hereby we responded point by point to each of the comments, our response appears in bold font while the Reviewers comments in regular font:

1. Would you please kindly correct all your typos and grammar errors throughout the manuscript

We have checked and corrected all the typos and grammar errors.

2. It looks like a systematic review. Please provide a reader with the objective and limitations. The Methods might be elaborated on.

Editors assigned our manuscript to the section "Minireviews". We provided the new subsection "AIM" in order to better define our objective. We also elaborated



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

on our Methods section, according to the Reviewer request. We do not add the section "LIMITATIONS" because it is not expected in the format "Minireviews" according to editorial policy.

3. Please reorganize your final paragraph with the separated summary and Conclusion.

The "Minireviews" format do not allow to separate Summary and Conclusion. Therefore, we do not change the last paragraph. However, if Editors thought that it is possible, we would change the last paragraph according to Reviewer request.

We also changed References format according to Editorial Guidelines as per Editor request.

Best Regards Simone Persampieri, MD