



Paper: “The Correlation of Collateral Circulation and Age during Acute Ischemic Heart Disease”

Corresponding Author: Iamze Taboridze

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n18p335

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr B Onyeneke, University of Nigeria Nsukka

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Inga Botchorishvili, Georgia

Published: 30.06.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr B Onyenekwe	Email:
University/Country: University of Nigeria Nsukka	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/05/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/05/20
Manuscript Title: Dependence of Collateral Circulation on Age During Acute Ischemic Heart Disease	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0576/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) Yes, but incomplete.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) The heading of “aims” is absent. The result produced very sketchy data about the study population and method. The conclusion is bulleted and vague. What is the value of this study? what has it added to what is known?</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments) Many. This is probably a consequence of the level of mastery of the English language by the authors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) The body of the both abstract and text are disjointed. The text is broken down into numerous paragraphs without justification. This greatly undermined the flow and understanding of the text.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments) No! The conclusion again is bulleted and vague and hanging in the air. It does not say the importance, what knowledge gap it has filled or the significance of the findings.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments) In the introduction, a number of basic concepts were not referenced. Doi were not inserted which is now customary.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	2
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Good paper I would say, but needs major English language editing so that readers can flow with you. The facts are there but are not well connected.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The study is significant and relevant.

This is an overview of the paper. It is obvious the author is not English speaking and this is where the problem begins. It is hard for me to follow the author' line of thought. This detracts from the value of the paper which on the surface appears quite good. It did not go into much detail in review of this paper because of this major obstacle.

I am an Endocrinologist and the technical details should be handled by a cardiologist henceforth. First thing to do; major English language editing.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Inga Botchorishvili	Email:
University/Country: Tbilisi Bokhua Memorial Cardiovascular center	
Date Manuscript Received: 11.05.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 17.05.2020
Manuscript Title: Dependence of Collateral Circulation on Age During Acute Ischemic Heart Disease	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 76.05.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is relevant to content of the article	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>An article is grammatically correct , easy and clear to undersand</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Methods are clearly explained, but it is better to mention a design of study (e.g. retrospective, crosssectional)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The summery is accurate and clear</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	

Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: