

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**Manuscript NO:** 51221

**Title:** Gender wise Prevalence of Cardiovascular Diseases among Geriatric Population of India: A Meta Analysis using R

Respected Sir

**I am very highly thankful to you for your valuable comments. It is my immense pleasure that you give me a chance to revise the manuscript according to the mentioned comments.**

**Reviewer 1:**

**Reviewer's code:**03702209

**Position:**Editorial Board

**Academic degree:**MD

**Professional title:**Associate Professor

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

This is a meta analysis investigating the prevalence of cardiovascular disease in the elderly and gender differences in India. 1. in the conclusion section of the abstract the authors state that there is significant difference in the prevalence of male and female subjects whereas this is not proven by statistical analysis 2. In page 3 three the authors state that cardiovascular disease is a type of non-communicable disease caused by infectious agents (????) and they also include in the list of diseases congenital heart disease although this is a study in the elderly. 3. The topic is not really attractive

**Reply:**

**Sir I have read carefully your comments and made the necessary changes to your comments at page 2 and page 3 in the highlighted text section of the revised manuscript.**

**Reviewer 2:**

**Reviewer's code:** 03846820

**Position:**Editorial Board

**Academic degree:**FACC, MD

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

**Reviewer's country:** Netherlands

Dear author, The paper represents results of the meta-analysis which is aiming to evaluate the gender wise prevalence of cardiovascular diseases among the geriatric population of India. 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) Please underline the novelty of the paper. There are some articles with the similar analysis of the Indian population. For instance a few of them must be mentioned and discussed in the paper: DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.114.008729, 10.4103/0970-0218.43225, 10.1016/j.jcdr.2013.03.002, and so on. 2) The general idea of the paper is clear but it is not sophisticated enough for meta-analysis. I would generally suggest elaborating the paper with the options which were mentioned in the Future Perspective. The points you have mentioned in the Limitations are actually the major one. Those Limitations are truly critical for the proper interpretation of your findings. The dramatic heterogeneity of the data is the main of them. Your Funnel plots, for instance, are very disturbing. 3) Conclusions: First, you do not have a Conclusion at all. Moreover, your brief conclusion in the abstract is not informative enough. Please, draw any conclusion. For a moment, this analysis in such an appearance is simply pointless. 4) Please underline in the Discussion the general situation in India in order to make your major point clear. 5) Figures and Tables: dear colleagues you are neither describe them nor discuss them. Please, do both. Your plots must be interpreted either in the Legend or in the Results and then discussed. You did not

estimate your Results on the plots at all. 6) Some your data require p value. Please mention p value for all variables.

**Reply:**

**Sir, according to your valuable comments, I have made the changes in my revised manuscript in the highlighted section at page 5, 6, 7, 8, 16 and 18 respectively.**

**Reviewer 3:**

**Reviewer's code:** 00397579

**Position:**Editorial Board

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

**Professional title:**Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's country:** United States

Nanda and Shivgotra reviewed literature on the prevalence of CVD in India and performed a meta-analysis for elderly India population. I found the study has a clear focus and provides important information to the literature. The study design is appropriate, and conclusions are supported by the results of their computational analysis. A few minor comments: 1) In the introduction section, please specify the definition of cardiovascular disease by following WHO documentations, i.e. <http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/noncommunicable-diseases/cardiovascular-diseases/cardiovascular-diseases2/definition-of-cardiovascular-diseases>. 2) There are various terms used in this manuscript describing "geriatric population", "elder population", "elderly population". I would suggest to discuss about WHO or other organization's age cut-off of "elderly", "geriatric" or "older adults" then point out how this manuscript adopted these definitions, and choose one term throughout the article thereafter. 3) page 3 para 2 line 5: the sentence needs to be revised 4) page 3 line 3 from the bottom: there is an error in the sentence: "CVDs are a type of non-communicable diseases caused by infectious agents...." 5) there is not necessary to use capital for cardiovascular disease in the middle of sentences (throughout the manuscript). If CVD abbreviation has

been established in the main text, it would be easier to follow by using CVD throughout the text.

**Reply:**

**Sir, I m really thankful to you for your valuable comments and made the necessary changes at page 3 of the revised manuscript and also used the abbreviations as suggested by you.**