Reviewer’s report

Title: A Modified Regimen of Extracorporeal Cardiac Shock Wave Therapy (CSWT) for Treatment of Coronary Artery Disease

Version: 1 Date: 18 April 2012

Reviewer: Adrian Borges

Reviewer’s report:

The aim of the study was to test a modified regimen of extra corporeal cardiac shock wave therapy (CSWT) for treatment of patients with coronary artery disease. The authors could demonstrate, that CSWT could improve symptoms and functional parameters with similar efficacy of one month vs three months duration regimen.

The authors used advanced new diagnostic methods and new therapeutic principles in their study, the results may have practical implications and might be useful for further studies (increasing of stem cell therapy).

1. The question posed by the authors is new and well defined
2. The methods are appropriate and well described, there are some questions (see remarks)
3. The data seem to be well controlled
4. The manuscript adheres to the relevant standards
5. The discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data
6. The title and abstract convey accurately what has been found
7. The writing is acceptable

There are some major questions and remarks:

1. The authors used peak systolic tissue Doppler-based strain rate (PSSR) under resting and load conditions and they could demonstrate an improvement with CSWT. Some readers might be sceptical about the reproducibility of tissue Doppler SR data in your study - please give us some data of your echo lab regarding inter- and intraobserver variability. PSSR was measured in all 17 segments, or in middle and basal segments?
2. What is really new of this study: only the modification of CSWT application (3 vs 1 month) – is this enough for a new publication?
3. The authors should discuss the usage the PSSR instead of 2D strain or global 2D strain measurements using the papers of Voigt et al. using PSSR and postsystolic shorting in stress echocardiography
4. Page 12: the last section is not very clear: “…PSSR after load and resting MPI were…”
Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.