

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

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 I²=93%).” However, I² for heterogeneity was 99% of meta-analysis of crude mortality rates in Figure 3. Please recheck about the I² presentation in abstract.

–

Response: The error is now corrected.

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/m² 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/m², for the purpose of this study, we chose a BMI value of ≤19.9 kg/m² 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/m²), nonobese (BMI 20.0–29.9 kg/m²), class I obesity (BMI, 30.0–34.9 kg/m²), class II obesity (BMI, 35.0–39.9 kg/m²), and class III (BMI ≥ 40.0 kg/m²).” Therefore, it might change the definition of underweight from <18.5 to ≤ 19.9 kg/m².

Response: The error is now corrected in Table 1.

-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.”

–

Response: The error is now corrected in Table 2.

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^{16,17,20} 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.”

Response: The error is now corrected

-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.” –

Response: The errors are now corrected

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 reporting? Yes –

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

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

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.

Response: Thank you for your comments. The references are now corrected.

6 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:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, 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. 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. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022.

Response: Done

Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

Response: Done

Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Response: Done. We have also cited RCA in the methods section.