

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58182

**Title:** Transradial versus transfemoral secondary access outcomes in TAVI - A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 02476743

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Statistician

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-08-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-24 00:22

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-24 00:32

**Review time:** 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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



**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](http://www.wjgnet.com)

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

Thank you for opportunity for reviewing this paper “Transradial versus transfemoral secondary access outcomes in TAVI - A systematic review and meta-analysis”. This article is interesting, but some issues should be explained more. 1. Who are the independent investigators? 2. It will be better to show kappa for the selection and data extraction. Please show the data of kappa of agreement during the systematic searches. How disagreements were solved during the systematic search among two independent reviewers? 3. Please add previous systematic reviews and what are their limitations and what was your rationale of doing this meta-analysis the introduction section. 4. In addition to the Newcastle Ottawa Scale, which is a validated tool and was an acceptable choice. However, to enhance the reproducibility and comparability of this review to future reviews of a similar topic (possibly an update of this review) I also recommend including a risk of bias assessment using ROBINS-I, since it is the newest and most robust method of assessing risk of bias in systematic reviews/meta-analyses. 5. What are your primary and secondary outcomes? 6. The GRADE tool is suggested. 7. Discussion should include what your review updates the previous evidence. If the above suggestions are incorporated and the paper is thoroughly edited, it will be a strong contribution to the literature.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58182

**Title:** Transradial versus transfemoral secondary access outcomes in TAVI - A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 03722832

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DNB, MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-08-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-23 13:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-25 02:46

**Review time:** 1 Day and 13 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 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 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:** [bpgooffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgooffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

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

Dear author has cited 4 kinds of vascular complications like stroke ,bleeding ,vascular complications and all cause mortality and the author has stated that transradial access as a secondary access is safer .However ,the author has significantly failed to establish how the transradial access has influenced the so significantly .I feel there are many other variables which have influenced the outcome has been ignored by the author like for one examples :EURO score ,the anatomy of the primary access sites and other comorbidities .Please define and specify the bleeding and vascular complications and provide objective details

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58182

**Title:** Transradial versus transfemoral secondary access outcomes in TAVI - A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00214240

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-08-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-26 09:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-26 09:57

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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

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

the problem of vascular complications after TAVR is an important one this meta analysis , mainly using retrospective data, is important as it shows clearly the advantage of the radial approach for the secondary access

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 58182

**Title:** Transradial versus transfemoral secondary access outcomes in TAVI - A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 03722832

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DNB, MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-08-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Chen-Chen Gao

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-10-23 15:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-10-24 17:47

**Review time:** 1 Day and 2 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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Privded the images given in the .ppt document [58182-Image-File-revision] are included in the main text with proper captions ,the revision would be reasonably good