

Answers to the reviewers comments:

Manuscript NO: 66790

Name of Journal: World Journal of Cardiology Manuscript

Title: Dabigatran in Cardiovascular Disease Management

1. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed wholly.

A. As requested, we corrected the above mentioned errors.

2. English is poor. The authors need to improve their writing style. The whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

A. Manuscript has been reviewed and edited by native English speaker.

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.

A. As requested, we have removed the specific line mentioned above and edited the abstract content.

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.

A. Further details has been added to abstract section to highlight objectives and methods.

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 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.

A. We added additional lines to introduction section to highlight the importance of discussion and make it more attractive.

10. Also, increase the number of references in the introduction section.

We have added couple of more references.

11. The introduction lacked a sound discussion on how this review was important for readers.

A. As mentioned above

12. Use the subsections for the sections "Postoperative Venous Thromboembolism Prophylaxis after Hip and Knee surgery"

A. We have added the subsections.

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.

A. We have added a table with dabigatran doses in various indications.

15. Cost Economic Analysis, Safety should need to focus. Write details on these topics. 16. Conclusion has to be improved by including more points.

A. We only mentioned key points in conclusion, safety section has been updated as requested.

17. References are not sufficient. The authors need to add more relevant references since it's a review article.

A. As mentioned above

1) Science editor:

1. Would you please kindly correct all your typos and grammar errors throughout the manuscript.

A. We have adjusted all the typo and grammar mistakes as requested.

2. I would generally suggest to quote recommended dosages of dabigatran mentioned in the guidelines. Moreover, it might be nice to have the impression about clinical studies/ trials that were sources of the particular guidelines.

A. The dosage we mentioned in various trails and studies are same as used in various guidelines.

3. There are many comparisons of dabigatran vs. warfarin but a lack of match with the other oral anticoagulants. There should be a transparent understanding of all the major pros and cons. The review should not become a sort of the ads. I would strongly recommend keeping a

scientific style of writing. Maybe it could be nice to provide a reader with one table underlining significant pros and cons of dabigatran or in comparison with others.

A. We have added a table regarding dosage of dabigatran in various indications. We only compared with warfarin to keep the review to the point.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure to the manuscript. The quality of the English language of the manuscript does not meet the requirements of the journal.

A. Manuscript has been reviewed and edited by native English speaker and we added a table as requested.