

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Methodology

**Manuscript NO:** 62011

**Title:** Evidence based review of management of cardiorenal syndrome type 1

**Reviewer's code:** 03650328

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FRCP (C), MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Canada

**Author's Country/Territory:** Malaysia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-12-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-09 13:21

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-11 20:44

**Review time:** 2 Days and 7 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Review for grammar. Which systematic review guidelines were followed? There is little synthesis conducted in this review. The individual studies are presented in the Results and in Table 2 and then discussed individually in the Discussion. It would be nice to see Table 2 grouped so that comparisons could be made across studies to see relative effect of treatment on, for example, kidney function and weight. In Figure 1, why are there 2 parallel arms? The legend should be expanded to better explain the figure. A figure showing the search strategy and the results with the various inclusion/exclusion criteria should be included.