

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10853

**Title:** Hydrocephalus after Subarachnoid Hemorrhage: A Meta-Analytic Comparison of Aneurysm Treatments

**Reviewer code:** 00646634

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-23 21:31

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-25 06:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Most common cause of SAH is trauma. Please change sentence in first paragraph of Introduction to: "The most common cause of nontraumatic subarachnoid hemorrhage (SAH), ruptured cerebral aneurysm ...." In the Results section a sentence is unclear as to what "(0.018)" refers to: "Statistical comparisons revealed significant differences between clipped and coiled cases regarding patient age ( $p = 0.045$ ), % females ( $p = 0.038$ ), and % vertebrobasilar aneurysms (0.018)." Should this be ( $p=0.018$ )? Lastly, in regards to developing hydrocephalus, what is the risk ratio, relative risk or absolute percent difference between clip or coil?

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10853

**Title:** Hydrocephalus after Subarachnoid Hemorrhage: A Meta-Analytic Comparison of Aneurysm Treatments

**Reviewer code:** 00646435

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-23 21:31

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-25 23:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for submitting your interesting work

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10853

**Title:** Hydrocephalus after Subarachnoid Hemorrhage: A Meta-Analytic Comparison of Aneurysm Treatments

**Reviewer code:** 00505578

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-23 21:31

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-02 03:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dr. Stein and colleagues presented a very well-written meta-analysis of published literature aiming to determine whether endovascular coiling or open surgical clipping of cerebral aneurysm affects incidence of chronic hydrocephalus. The authors concluded that endovascular coiling has overall a lower risk of developing chronic hydrocephalus when compared to open surgical clipping. My only question is whether the authors were able to adjust for other variables which may potentially affect the development of chronic hydrocephalus in this meta-analysis.

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 10853

**Title:** Hydrocephalus after Subarachnoid Hemorrhage: A Meta-Analytic Comparison of Aneurysm Treatments

**Reviewer code:** 02826575

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-04-23 21:31

**Date reviewed:** 2014-05-04 23:53

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"/> Existing	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please add the etiology of hydrocephalus after SAH (including new theories) to the discussion...