

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7633

Title: Management of Traumatic Brain Injuries in Patients on Dabigatran

Reviewer code: 01911885

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2013-11-27 21:02

Date reviewed: 2014-01-01 20:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper entitled ‘*Management of Traumatic Brain Injuries in Patients on Dabigatran’ *reports that Dabigatran Etxilate (DE), a recently approved anticoagulation drug, has no significant advantage compared to warfarin in cure and decreasing mortality of patients with traumatic brain injury (TBI). This will be relevant clinical report on the effect of DE and I think it is publishable in EPSP after minor revision. I have some concerns as following.

- 1) Title needs to be revised. It sounds too neutral and contains no author’s conclusion about the effect of DE.
- 2) In text, author needs to explain more about why DE was not more effective than warfarin in mechanistic aspects (i. e., mechanisms, effective dose, LD50 in animal studies, etc). Since DE is known as an effective drug for TBI in previous studies, this point will be highly helpful to other clinicians.
- 3) Statistical values are not described well. These values should be described together with every data in the table. In the text of result section, which kind of statistical methods are used and why should be described. Any conclusion drawn from incomplete statistics is actually invalid.
- 4) Data table lacks data on intensive care length of stay (iLOS) value although it is described in the abstract and text.
- 5) In result section (page-4), author mentions figure-1 but I could not find the figure in the file.