

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**Manuscript NO:** 64826

**Title:** Association of Marital Status with Takotsubo Syndrome (Broken Heart Syndrome) Among Adults in the United States.

**Reviewer's code:** 05130626

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-02-24 14:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-02-26 01:56

**Review time:** 1 Day and 11 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thank you for the opportunity of reviewing the interesting original article. I think this study is a well-designed case control study focusing on interesting aim. However, I think this article has some points to be improvement as follows: Major comments: 1. I think it is better to discuss not only marital status (MS) and conventional coronary risk factors but also other previously proposed risk factors of Takotsubo cardiomyopathy (TCM) such as neurological or psychiatric disorders (N Engl J Med 2015;373(10):929). 2. If possible, the authors should additionally adjust neurological or psychiatric disorders as potential confounders. 3. Even if the authors cannot additionally adjust neurological or psychiatric disorders as potential confounders, they should introduce these previously proposed risk factors of TCM in “Background” or the beginning of “Discussion” and note the importance of these potential confounders in “Limitation” paragraph. 4. Given TCM is common in female, exclusion and differentiation of coronary spastic angina (CSA) is important. How the authors exclude CSA from TCM? Did they perform hyperventilation stress EKG test or acetylcholine stress test during coronary angiography for diagnosis of CSA? If not, the authors should note the possibility of cases with CSA in the participants. 5. It is true that all characteristics are matched, yet I think it is still better to indicate p-value in Table 1 to visually understand the characteristics of each groups. Minor comments: 1. Please insert a blank line between “Email” and “ABSTRACT”. 2. ABSTRACT-RESULTS, Line 2: “marched” should be “matched”. 3. Please insert a blank line above “INTRODUCTION” of the main text. 4. “MATERIAL AND METHODS” p.4, 1line 1; “Marital status which was obtained the National Center for Health ...” should be “Marital status which was obtained from the National Center for Health ...”.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**Manuscript NO:** 64826

**Title:** Association of Marital Status with Takotsubo Syndrome (Broken Heart Syndrome) Among Adults in the United States.

**Reviewer's code:** 05469274

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-02-24 20:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-03-03 02:34

**Review time:** 6 Days and 6 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript NO 64826, titled Association of Marital Status with Takotsubo Syndrome (Broken Heart Syndrome) Among Adults in the United States. General comment:

The paper is generally well written, structured and easy to read. Some punctuations were missing. Thank you for your work! Title: ü The title is clear and adequate for the content.

English: ü Meaning is clearly conveyed, but it needs another revision.

Structure: ü Well organized. Scientific quality rating - This paper presents an original study. - The study results are important, and they are likely to be cited.

Abstract Summarize and reflect the work in the manuscript. What is the purpose of mentioning: bed size of the hospital? Check this please "MS who were marched to 295 controls" ü Keywords: reflect the content. Introduction: The introduction was concise, well structured but it needs to be more informative.

Methods: ü Clear and well explained! 1- Check this please: "MS who were marched to 295 controls" "Marital status information which was obtained the National Center for Health Statistics" "Case was defined as patients" 2- What is the purpose of mentioning: bed size of hospital? 3- "A control was defined as any patient without TTS diagnosis during hospitalization."

If a control subject is a previous patient with TTS, wouldn't that affect the results? Results and discussion: -Results were well-represented. -Discussion need to be more developed. It s required to add more findings of similar studies (if found). -May the "Type of insurance" reflect the socioeconomic status? If yes, it would be interesting to include it in the discussion. Same for "Health conditions »!

Conclusion: ü Conclusions are related to the aims of the work. References: ü Well listed. ü The manuscript cite appropriately recent studies. Tables: Well presented, clear and informative but Table 1: Please check the percentages of participants according to their marital status ü Cases : 39+57.3 =96.3

ü Non-CVD Controls :  $42.7+61=103.7$  Also, I think that you need to check all the statistical analyses for cases and Non-CVD Controls if they were calculated using this data. You mentioned, “inability to study the quality of marriage or sex differences on the relation of MS with TTS.” Also mentioned, “90% and 88% being women and reporting white race, respectively.” It would be interesting if you add the sex and age range in table 1. Then study the sex as a separate factor (table 2). Thank you for your work!

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**Manuscript NO:** 64826

**Title:** Association of Marital Status with Takotsubo Syndrome (Broken Heart Syndrome) Among Adults in the United States.

**Reviewer's code:** 05469274

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** Man Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-03-31 10:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-02 16:55

**Review time:** 2 Days and 6 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors made most of the required corrections as appropriate! They enriched the introduction and discussion as requested. Questions were answered and explained clearly. We thank them for the expended effort on this study.