

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77339

**Title:** Body mass index and outcomes of patients with cardiogenic shock: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05936182

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-05-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-07-10 16:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-10 16:25

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<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  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

<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**

Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. I don't feel qualified to judge about the English language and style due to not native language. 1. The title reflect the main subject about BMI and cardiogenic shock, title was clear and easy to understand. 2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. 3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. The authors explain BMI definition and cardiogenic shock. The introduction, although rather short, provides foundational information relevant to the study. 5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study protocol were clear. 6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study. 7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. 8. Tables and figures sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important, and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. However, some of references were incorrect style for this journal.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 77339

**Title:** Body mass index and outcomes of patients with cardiogenic shock: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06250974

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Instructor, Lecturer, Staff Physician, Teacher

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-05-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-07-08 17:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-07-14 04:02

**Review time:** 5 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<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
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this work. Detailed comments about this case report are as follows: -1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes -2 Abstract. -In Results, there was stated that “On meta-analysis, we noted that crude mortality rates did not significantly differ between overweight/obese and normal patients after cardiogenic shock (OR: 0.95 95% CI 0.79, 1.15 I<sup>2</sup>=93%).” However, I<sup>2</sup> for heterogeneity was 99% of meta-analysis of crude mortality rates in Figure 3. Please recheck about the I<sup>2</sup> presentation in abstract. -3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes -4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes -5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods in adequate detail? Yes -6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? Yes -7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Yes -8 Illustrations and tables. -In Table 1, there was a lack of BMI definition between 18.5 to <20 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in Sreenivasan’s study. However, the original study (Sreenivasan 2021, <https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/full/10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.120.007937>) stated that “Although Center for Disease Control and Prevention classifies underweight BMI as <18.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, for the purpose of this study, we chose a BMI value of ≤19.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup> to define the underweight population because of ICD code limitations. Based on the Center for Disease Control and Prevention definition of obesity, the study cohort was stratified into underweight (BMI ≤19.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), nonobese (BMI 20.0-29.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), class I obesity (BMI, 30.0-34.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), class II obesity (BMI, 35.0-39.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), and class III

(BMI  $\geq 40.0$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>).” Therefore, it might change the definition of underweight from  $<18.5$  to  $\leq 19.9$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>. -In Table 2, there were presented as “adjusted mortality rates” and “crude mortality rates.” Its title was “Sensitivity analysis for adjusted mortality rates;” however, it was implied as showing only the adjusted mortality. It might change the title to “Sensitivity analysis for mortality rates.” -9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes -10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes -11 References. -There were inconsistent in the inline citation format as follows: in the result as a superscript “Amongst the included studies, three studies<sup>16,17,20</sup> reported...” and in other places in the manuscript as bracket such as “On the exclusion of the study of Patlolla et al[17] and Chatterjee et al[20], the results indicated no difference in the risk of mortality in overweight/obese vs normal patients.” -Please correct about journal abbreviations of reference 4 “Kushner RF, Ryan DH. Assessment and lifestyle management of patients with obesity: Clinical recommendations from systematic reviews. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association. 2014;312:943-52. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.10432,” reference 8 “Niedziela J, Hudzik B, Niedziela N, Gąsior M, Gierlotka M, Wasilewski J, et al. The obesity paradox in acute coronary syndrome: a meta-analysis. European Journal of Epidemiology. 2014;29:801-12. doi:10.1007/s10654-014-9961-9,” reference 13 “Meng F, Guo F, Abulimiti B, Zhao K, Dong Y, Ma X, et al. Body mass index and all-cause mortality in patients with cardiogenic shock: A systematic review and meta-analysis. American Journal of Emergency Medicine. 2021;43:97-102. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2021.01.003,” and reference 21 “Lovren F, Teoh H, Verma S. Obesity and Atherosclerosis: Mechanistic Insights. Canadian Journal of Cardiology. 2015;31:177-83. doi:10.1016/j.cjca.2014.11.031.” -12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes -13 Research methods and reporting. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and



**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>

reporting? Yes -14 Ethics statements. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Not applicable