

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 55402

**Title:** Systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes of anatomic repair in congenitally corrected transposition of great arteries

**Reviewer's code:** 03846820

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACC, MD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ruo-Yu Ma (Quit in 2020)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-04-12 07:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-04-13 15:46

**Review time:** 1 Day and 8 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 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  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

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

Dear author, The paper represents results of the systematic review and meta-analysis which is focused on outcomes of anatomic repair in congenital corrected transposition of great arteries. The article is written with the good English-speaking adduction of the arguments. The article is sufficiently novel and very interesting to warrant publication. All the key elements are presented and described clearly. The most discussable options in the article are: 1) Would you please kindly correct all your minor typos and grammar errors throughout the manuscript. 2) You have underlined the main limitations of your study and it is quite critical. The point is your figures. Is that possible to upgrade the level of the representation with more conventional style and numbers? E.g. figure 3 is nice but rather challenging. 3) Figure 2: do you think it might be nice to change the scale to see the difference clearly. 4) I would kindly suggest you to elaborate on your statistical level in sense of everything including your Methods, Limitations and Conclusions.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 55402

**Title:** Systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes of anatomic repair in congenitally corrected transposition of great arteries

**Reviewer's code:** 00227375

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ruo-Yu Ma (Quit in 2020)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-04-13 10:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-04-17 11:09

**Review time:** 4 Days

<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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>Re-review</b>	<input 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**

This is an interesting systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes of anatomic repair in congenital corrected transposition of great arteries. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. I have no question about this manuscript.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 55402

**Title:** Systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes of anatomic repair in congenitally corrected transposition of great arteries

**Reviewer's code:** 02577402

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ruo-Yu Ma (Quit in 2020)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-04-14 08:44

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-04-19 10:07

**Review time:** 5 Days and 1 Hour

<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 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this study, the authors did an systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes of anatomic repair in congenital corrected transposition of great arteries. Some problems existed. 1. The language needs to be improved because of some grammar mistakes and difficult sentences. What does “v” mean in the sentence “this is also a sample with a greater proportion of gouble switch operations v atrial switch Rastelli operations.”? 2. Abbreviations: When using an abbreviation, the full phrase has to be given at the first time of use. Later, you can always use the abbreviation without mentioning the full phrase. For example, congenitally corrected transposition of great arteries (cc-TGA). However, the authors did not abide by this rule all the times. For example, AV, NYHA, ECMO/LVAD, TR, ASR, LVOT, VR, etc. Please check the whole article and correct all these issues. 3. Key words: Please give the full phrase of AV here in “AV block”.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 55402

**Title:** Systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes of anatomic repair in congenitally corrected transposition of great arteries

**Reviewer's code:** 02446694

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACC, FAHA, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ruo-Yu Ma (Quit in 2020)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-04-12 10:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-04-24 23:25

**Review time:** 12 Days and 13 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



**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**

The authors performed the systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes of anatomic repair in patients with congenital corrected transposition of great arteries. This systematic review seems to be educative. As a reviewer, I have one request and one question. #1 In the main results regarding short-term and long-term outcomes, it is somewhat difficult to understand them. Thus, the authors should show their main results in another table to make the readers understand them easily. #2 In the "follow up outcomes", the authors adopted LV dysfunction. The authors should define them in the "Method" section.