

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our paper. Please find the response to the reviewers as below (highlighted in red).

Reviewer 1: No comments

Reviewer 2:

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.

Thank you.

Comments: 1. Abstract – State start date of literature search.

- The search was performed from inception through the specified date. Thank you.

2. Define small and large shunts (i.e. presence of right-sided volume loading?).

- Shunt size was either defined by the diameter of the shunt or number of bubbles seen in the LA.

3. Abstract states literature reviewed until March 2018 but Methods state September 2018.

- Thank you for pointing out the error. We corrected that.

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?

- We used the study with the longest follow-up.

5. Review for grammar (e.g. a-priori should be italicized a priori).

- Thank you. Grammar review performed as suggested.

6. Results- what is the difference between procedural success and PFO closure?

- Procedural success was successful deployment during the procedure. PFO closure: absence of shunt at follow-up.

7. Results – less AF with PFO occluder.

- It was numerically fewer compared to other devices.

8. Figure legends are misspelled (e.g. Forrest) and too brief.

- Thank you for pointing out. Changed as suggested.

9. In Table 2, highlight the groups (if any) in each trial that were significantly different from each other.

- Thank you for the suggestion. The studies were largely matched for the baseline characteristics as presented in the table 2.

Reviewer 3:

Important issue nicely performed meta-analysis not really adding new information, but still interesting study.

Thank you.