

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 16626

Title: Sleep-associated Movement Disorders and the Risk of Cardiovascular Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 01482015

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-01-27 13:31

Date reviewed: 2015-01-28 20:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Editor: Dr. Fang and colleagues made a meta-analysis regrading sleep-associated movement disorders and the risk of cardiovascular disease. In general, the paper was well written. Some issues should be addressed before acceptance. The major issues. 1. Some descriptive sentences in discussion were errored such as : on page 8: In a cohort study, Elwood et al. identified RLS is associated with a "significant" increase in ischaemic heart disease events....(OR=1.24, 95% CI=0.89–1.71 (it should be 1.74)) that the association was not "significant". 2. I do't know the reason why "The discrepancy between these two results and those of previous studies may be explained by the prospective cohort study, which was designed to assess incident CVD cases" on page 9. There were also other prospective cohort study targeting incident CVD and the association was signifcant. The minor issuss. Some words were not correctly spelled in the manuscript. Please correct them.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 16626

Title: Sleep-associated Movement Disorders and the Risk of Cardiovascular Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Reviewer's code: 02639698

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-01-27 13:31

Date reviewed: 2015-01-31 17:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written and concise meta-analysis. We suggest the Authors to add a paragraph/a table summarizing the key messages.