

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Rejection

**Specific Comments to Authors:** There is no doubt that in its essence the manuscript was meant to bring us a review dealing with an interesting and important topic, but did not live up to the requirements.

My specific critics are as follows:

1: ABSTRACT. The abstract should be more focused in summarizing only, but all the main messages from the review.

2: INTRODUCTION. Also this section is relatively confusing. I suggest rewording being more focused on the true background of the research the authors performed as well as to the main research question.

3: METHODOLOGY. It is not clear on which basis / protocol the references used for a review were selected. Please, clarify.

4: MAIN (review?) TEXT. The authors should better report and discuss the main results of the analysis. The text should be plain and easy to understand for the reader. I suggest to reword.

5: Figure 1. The figures provided are probably the best part of the paper submitted. They are well prepared to alleviate the text and keep the reader attention.

6: CONCLUSION(S). This final section of the manuscript should also be significantly rewritten / rephrased. It does not truly cover the essence of the findings from the present analysis.

7: The review is written with long paragraphs and long phrases. As such, it requires major language/style revision. In case of resubmission, please, substantially modify and reword the manuscript.

**Answer:** We would like to heartily thank the reviewer for his/her instructive criticism. All comments have been addressed in each part of the manuscript, and appropriate amendments have been performed, especially in the Methods and Discussion sections. A

thorough revision in language, along with modification in the Methods and Discussion sections have been conducted. Additional amendments in the References section have been done. We would like to thank the reviewer for his/her valuable comments and the opportunity to revise our manuscript, aiming at the substantial improvement of our manuscripts overall quality.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade A (Excellent)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** In this meta-analysis, the authors investigated the effects of DPP-4i on MACE and arrhythmia. They provide up-to-date of data regarding this topic. I have no specific comments.

**Answer:** We would like to cordially thank the reviewer for considering and appreciated our meta-analysis for potential publication in World Journal of Cardiology.

## EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

**(1) *Science editor:*** 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a meta-analysis of the cardiovascular outcome trials assessing the cardiovascular efficacy and safety of DPP-4 inhibitors. The topic is within the scope of the WJC. (1) Classification: Grade A and Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors investigated the effects of DPP-4i on MACE and arrhythmia, and provide up-to-date of data regarding this topic. The manuscript deals with an interesting and important topic; and (3) Format: There is 1 figure. (4) References: A total of 24 references are cited, including 10 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are no self-cited references; and (6) References recommend: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by peer reviewer(s), especially the references published by the peer reviewer(s) themselves. If the authors found the peer reviewer(s) request the authors to cite improper references published by themselves, please send the peer reviewer's ID number to the [editorialoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:editorialoffice@wjgnet.com). The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, and the PRISMA 2009 Checklist. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJC. 5 Issues raised: (1) The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words; (2) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; (3) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; (4) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (5) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

**Answer:** We would like to thank the Science Editor for his/her valuable comments. We have now amended our manuscript's title (13 words). We provide in the revised manuscript Authors' contributions and Highlights sections. We have also revised References section

strictly according to journal's guidelines. Finally, we provide all required figures in high analysis in a .ppt file. Thank you once again for your valuable comments aiming at the substantial improvement of our manuscript's overall quality.

**(2) *Company editor-in-chief:*** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Cardiology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. A re-review is required for the revised manuscript.