PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78310

Title: Video-assisted bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation improves the quality of chest compressions during simulated cardiac arrests: A systemic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03346384

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACC, MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-21

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-28 05:07

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-28 18:54

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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
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

The authors have performed a meta analysis of randomized studies comparing video assisted CPR to telephone assisted CPR in out of hospital cardiac arrest patients (simulated by mannequin) with young volunteers playing the role of first responders. They included 6 such studies and assessed CPR quality (such as: compression rate, number of subjects who performed adequate compression rate, compression depth, number of subjects who performed adequate compression depth and position of hands) and time related quality metrics (such as: time to initiate compressions and total hand off time). The authors demonstrated that by using video assisted CPR there was a significant increase or improvement in compression rate but there was no difference in compression depth or hand position or time related quality metrics. Hence the authors conclude that based on their meta analysis there was an improvement in compression rate with video assisted CPR compared to telephone assisted CPR. My comments: 1. The tables and figures were not included in the manuscript file, so I could not review any of them. 2. Would be good to include a table of the studies included in this analysis, number of subjects, main end points studied and main findings of each of these studies. 3. Include a table of all the outcomes analyzed in this study for ease of the reader. 4. In the introduction section - the mean survival rate of OHCA is 7.6%, seems really low. Is it survival to hospital discharge with intact Neuro function? Need to clarify this. 5. Last paragraph of introduction section: quantitative studies or qualitative studies? 6. How was the depth of compression assessed in these studies? Need to clarify this. 7. In the discussion section, need more information on studies demonstrating efficacy of video

assisted CPR.   8. Discussion section, in included some studies the correct hand position of the participants ...... - what does this mean? Need more clarity. Are they quoting previous studies if so need reference.   9. Mention all the limitation in a separate section labeled limitations.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78310

Title: Video-assisted bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation improves the quality of chest compressions during simulated cardiac arrests: A systemic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03497479

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-21

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-02 06:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-02 18:44

Review time: 12 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] 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 [Y] 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

I read with interest the article "Video-assisted Bystander Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation Improves the Quality of Chest Compressions during Simulated Cardiac Arrests: A Systemic Review and Meta-Analysis". Out of a potential 256, a small number of studies were included in the analysis, only 6 of them.   The main objection to the authors is that only the qualities of chest compression were analyzed. In addition, it would be significantly more significant if the outcome of CPR was analyzed in the form of the establishment of circulation and heart rhythm, as well as patient survival.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78310

Title: Video-assisted bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation improves the quality of chest compressions during simulated cardiac arrests: A systemic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04551037

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-21

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-02 05:42

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-06 16:14

Review time: 4 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] 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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection

Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I found the manuscript interesting and well shaped.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78310

Title: Video-assisted bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation improves the quality of chest compressions during simulated cardiac arrests: A systemic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05827902

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACC, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-06-21

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-05 01:39

Reviewer performed review: 2022-08-10 17:37

Review time: 5 Days and 15 Hours

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

The authors describe a meta-analysis and review of video-assisted bystander CPR on the quality of chest compression during CPR. The study demonstrated some important findings. For one, it suggests that video assisted bystander CPR can improve chest compression rates. However, no significant effects on depth of chest compression or correct hand positioning was demonstrated; this can be related to various factors as appropriately acknowledged by the authors.   Further studies in real world setting may provide more definitive data on the research question posed by the authors; video assisted bystander CPR is a tool with potential to improve outcomes in out-of-hospital cardiac arrests.   The authors have done good work in describing the elements of the study well.