

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 66790

Title: Dabigatran in Cardiovascular Disease Management: A Comprehensive Review

Reviewer's code: 05457585 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-06

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-26 11:57

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-04 09:36

Review time: 8 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



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

Manuscript NO: 66790 Name of Journal: World Journal of Cardiology Manuscript Type: REVIEW Dabigatran in Cardiovascular Disease Management: A Comprehensive Review In this review, the authors attempted to provide an insight into Dabigatran in Cardiovascular Disease Management. However, your article is inadequately presented. Furthermore, there are many grammatical mistakes and spelling mistakes as well. Although the article has scientific rigor, several major flows need to be improved before publication. Major Comments: 1. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed wholly. 2. English is poor. The authors need to improve their writing style. The whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers. 3. The abstract section is unsuitable—no focus point in the abstract section. 4. The abstract section rewrites the sentence: " Direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) have been studied in a variety of cardiovascular conditions in the last decade including but not limited to atrial fibrillation, deep venous thrombosis, pulmonary embolism, coronary artery disease and left ventricular thrombus." 5. Also need to add a background with the significant observation interpreting a rational conclusion. 6. The major problem with this review is that it is written very broadly and lacks specificity, and focus on a narrow subsection of areas affiliated with Cardiovascular Disease Management. For this reason, this work lacks depth, and it appears very superficial and very diluted, touching upon an array of aspects only on the surface. The scientific literature is saturated with many such review papers already. 7. State the objective, methods, significant observation, and conclusion of the review clearly in the abstract section. 8. The introduction section is inconsistent. Authors are suggested to change the introduction significantly by including recent literature related to cardiovascular disease (percentage, the rate in global perspective, etc.). 9. The introduction part appears less informative. The article is mainly concerned with Cardiovascular Disease Management. However, less information has



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

been presented in perspective to explain the management approaches. The authors just stated the tiny details, but the authors should elaborate on the management approaches for increasing attractiveness. 10. Also, increase the number of references in the introduction section. 11. The introduction lacked a sound discussion on how this review was important for readers. 12. Use the subsections for the sections "Postoperative Venous Thromboembolism Prophylaxis after Hip and Knee surgery" 13. The authors just have written several issues randomly. Many sentences/information everywhere in the manuscript has serious flaws that have withdrawn my attention from it. Need to maintain a logical flow. 14. The major weakness of this review is the lack of any tables or significant figures. It is highly recommended to add at least two tables and four figures. 15. Cost Economic Analysis, Safely should need to focus. Write details on these topics. 16. Conclusion has to be improved by including more points. 17. References are not sufficient. The authors need to add more relevant references since it's a review article.