Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, This article represents the retrospective case-control study aiming to compare the treatment outcomes of AngioJet rheolytic thrombectomy vs. catheter-directed thrombolysis in patients with filter-related caval thrombosis. The article is written with 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) Would you please kindly correct all your typos and grammar errors throughout the manuscript? 2) Please provide the reader with the relevant information about statistical power including sample size calculation. The point is if you deliver the results of the retrospective study, it must be justified in the Introduction and supported by a strong statistical approach. Please underline the value of your study. 3) Regarding "There was no symptomatic PE after the treatment in either group", how long your follow-up was? Are you talking about the outcome at discharge? Did any patients have CT-angiopulmonography after the intervention? Did you analyze outcomes through the months? Did you test D-dimer in these patients, including follow-up? 4) Table 1 becomes

confusing especially when in the text you are mentioning the absence of symptomatic PE. There must be some elaboration on pulmonary embolism in 12 patients. Maybe it might be nice to make a sort of subanalysis in that subset merely because this is the most critical part of the story. 5) The definitions of your clinical conditions must be provided for the reader. Please elaborate on the description of your interventional technique in the sense of reproducibility. Many details are missing especially those that can be critical for technical success and outcomes. 6) Regarding bias, please elaborate on the topic in the limitations. Mentioned limitations without any remarks are unacceptable. There must be a vision or the author's position. Please generally underline the clinical value of your findings and the obstacles that you faced. Why could you not run the prospective observational study?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 81228

Title: Clinical Outcomes of AngioJet Pharmacomechanical Thrombectomy Versus Catheter-Directed Thrombolysis for the Treatment of Filter-Related Caval Thrombosis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05401900

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-30

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-05 19:09

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-06 08:33

Review time: 13 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your submission. Your manuscript was an interesting read. The manuscript is very well organized and follows a clear flow.   There are only a series of writing errors, English language errors in the text that should be corrected. It is much better to understand if this amount of data is presented in the form of graphs. The figures presented in this draft are not very expressive and clear. It is necessary to provide images with more features. The use of schematic figures is necessary to compare these two types of methods.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [Y] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, Thank you very much for your substantial efforts to improve the article. I have a few suggestions though: 1) Your sample size calculation is mathematically correct, but not methodologically. You mention the article "Zhu J, et al. A case-controlled study on AngioJet rheolytic thrombectomy and catheter-directed thrombolysis in the treatment of acute lower extremity deep venous thrombosis. Vascular. 2020;28(2):177-182", but what kind of study is that?! Do you know the statistical power in that article? Can that study be used to calculate a sample size in your study? Statistically speaking the article looks very immature. Please, upgrade the level of your methodological approach. 2) You did not underline the clinical value and novelty of the article. 3) All your remarks for the peers must be incorporated in the article. Those answers are for a reader, not for a peer.