

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 45336

Title: Who benefits from percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale versus medical therapy for stroke prevention? In-depth and updated meta-analysis of randomized trials

Reviewer's code: 03650328

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2019-01-08

Date reviewed: 2019-01-11

Review time: 7 Hours, 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors performed a literature review and meta-analysis of studies comparing percutaneous PFO device closure vs. medical therapy (anti-platelet and/or anticoagulation) following stroke in adults. Overall, the study is well-written with

clear objectives, rationale, analysis and results. Comments: 1. Abstract – State start date of literature search. 2. Define small and large shunts (i.e. presence of right-sided volume loading?). 3. Abstract states literature reviewed until March 2018 but Methods state September 2018. 4. Results – in the one study with 2 publications with different durations of follow-up, how was this handled? Was the earlier paper omitted from the analysis? 5. Review for grammar (e.g. a-priori should be italicized a priori). 6. Results- what is the difference between procedural success and PFO closure? The device was deployed successfully but there was/was not a residual shunt? 7. Results – less AF with PFO occluder. ?Statistics 8. Figure legends are misspelled (e.g. Forrest) and too brief. 9. In Table 2, highlight the groups (if any) in each trial that were significantly different from each other.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Cardiology

Manuscript NO: 45336

Title: Who benefits from percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale versus medical therapy for stroke prevention? In-depth and updated meta-analysis of randomized trials

Reviewer's code: 00214240

Reviewer's country: Belgium

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2019-01-08

Date reviewed: 2019-01-16

Review time: 23 Hours, 7 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

important issue nicely performed meta analysis not really adding new information, but still interesting study

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No