



**Paper: “Prinzmetal Angina: A Case Report of Recurrent Ventricular Fibrillation”**

**Submitted: 18 December 2025**

**Accepted: 05 April 2026**

**Published: 30 April 2026**

Corresponding Author: Iamze Taboridze

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n12p24

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Syed Shadab  
Jazan University, Saudi Arabia

Reviewer 2: Julian Kraja  
University of Shkodra “Luigj Gurakuqi”, Albania

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***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 SHADAB UDDIN	
University/Country: jazan university/Saudi Arabia	
Date Manuscript Received: 05/02/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/02/2026
Manuscript Title: Prinzmetal Angina: A Case of Recurrent Ventricular Fibrillation	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0105/26	
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: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

#### Evaluation Criteria:

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

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title accurately conveys the manuscript's therapeutic purpose. It correctly draws attention to the connection between ventricular fibrillation and Prinzmetal angina.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>The case and clinical course are sufficiently summarized in the abstract. It would be better, though, if the backdrop, case facts, and conclusion were organized more clearly. It is important to briefly explain the therapeutic justification for stenting.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>The manuscript contains several grammatical and stylistic inconsistencies. These do not obscure understanding but require professional language editing to meet publication standards.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>In general, the diagnostic work-up and its clinical appearance are covered in detail. For improved logical uniformity, some procedural elements should be explained, especially those pertaining to the timing of procedures and the justification for repeat angiography.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results and imaging findings are clearly presented. The relationship between vasospasm and ventricular fibrillation is convincingly documented. Minor clarification regarding CT-angiography discrepancy would strengthen interpretation.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>The case is suitably connected to the body of current literature in the discussion. It should, however, be a little more targeted and closely evaluate the dangers and signs of stenting in cases with vasospastic angina. Although it may be expressed more cautiously, the conclusion is justified.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
The references are relevant and current. Minor formatting consistency checks are recommended.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The case is clinically meaningful and well documented. The manuscript would benefit from language polishing, clearer chronological organization of events, and more balanced discussion of stenting indications in vasospastic angina. Clarifying the discrepancy between CT and angiographic findings and slightly strengthening the pathophysiological explanation will improve scientific clarity. With these revisions, the paper would be suitable for publication.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

### ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

***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: Julian KRAJA	
University/Country: University of Shkodra “Luigj Gurakuqi”	
Date Manuscript Received: 12. 03. 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 12. 03. 2026
Manuscript Title: <b>Prinzmetal Angina: A Case of Recurrent Ventricular Fibrillation</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0105/26</b>	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title is correct, but I suggest adding the phrase - A case report - to the title.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract does not clearly separate the purpose, methods, etc. but this does not pose any problem</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>There are frequent grammatical problems, punctuation issues, spacing inconsistencies, citation formatting errors, and awkward sentence constructions throughout the text. But easily adjustable.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>

<i>The manuscript would benefit from a clearer explanation of why stenting was chosen, especially since vasospastic angina is generally managed medically first and stenting remains controversial in some settings. A simple timeline would greatly enhance this section.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The results are understandable, but they are not presented with a good level of clarity. For example, the manuscript sometimes mixes interpretation with raw findings, which can blur the distinction between observed results and inferred causality.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Although the manuscript argues the case, it leans toward the adoption of stenting as a solution, whereas the broader literature on vasospastic angina usually treats stenting as a selective strategy rather than a standard approach.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The reference list is good, but there are some problems such as:</i> <i>1. The formatting of the references is inconsistent.</i> <i>2. Some in-text citations are messy or incomplete.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

I would like to congratulate the authors on their fine work, but before it can be published, the manuscript needs considerable linguistic editing, clearer case chronology, and more precise clinical reasoning before it is ready for submission to the journal.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

The paper can still be accepted, but a linguistic edit must be made.