

Dear Editor,

We want to thank the reviewers for their time and effort in reviewing our manuscript. We sincerely appreciate their comments and have endeavored to respond with an acceptable revision.

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: To: Editorial Board World Journal of Cardiology Title: "Safety and Efficacy of Soluble Guanylate Cyclase Stimulators in Patients with Heart Failure: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis" Dear Editor, I read this manuscript and I think that: -

- The paper should be revised due to typos. For example, revised the use of brackets in the results section of the abstract ("however, sGC stimulators had no impact on all-cause and cardiovascular mortality (RR 0.96, 95% CI 0.86-1.07, $p=0.45$) and (RR 0.94, 95% CI 0.83-1.06, $p=0.29$), respectively"). - The English of the paper should be revised by a native English speaker.

Reply: The paper has been thoroughly revised by a native English speaker who has made sure that all typos, spelling and grammatical mistakes have been eliminated

- - Indeed, the authors should better discuss about ARNI in the introduction section. The authors may consider the paper from Acanfora D et al. Clin Drug Investig. 2020 May;40(5):493-501. -

Reply: Thank you for this suggestion. We have added discussion points about ARNI in the introduction section as follows:

"The therapeutic augmentation of NPS with a combination angiotensin receptor–neprilysin inhibitor (sacubitril) has proven to be immensely beneficial, to the extent that the pioneering PARADIGM trial was halted early given the clear benefits in terms reducing mortality (RR 0.84, 95% CI, 0.76-0.93; $P<0.001$) and hospitalization (by 21%; $P<0.001$) compared to ACEI alone.^[5] "

- The flow chart is not visible. Please revise the figure. -

Reply: We have added better quality image to the manuscript

- Due to the low grade in heterogeneity, why did the authors not consider the fixed model analysis? Please discuss.

Reply: That's a great observation. We agree that heterogeneity was minimal but the decision for random effect model was made based on the Cochrane guidelines and due to the fact that the effect size for individual studies was different knowing the drug used and populations included were variable. As mentioned in the Cochrane Handbook Chapter 13.

“The selection of a computational model should be based on our expectation about whether or not the studies share a common effect size and on our goals in performing the analysis.”

“the decision to use the random-effects model should be based on our understanding of whether or not all studies share a common effect size, and not on the outcome of a statistical test (especially since the test for heterogeneity often suffers from low power).”

<https://www.meta-analysis.com/downloads/Meta-analysis%20Fixed-effect%20vs%20Random-effects%20models.pdf>

Step 6: Editorial Office's comments

The author must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which listed below:

(1) *Science Editor*: 1 **Scientific quality**: The manuscript describes a meta-analysis of the safety and efficacy of soluble guanylate cyclase stimulators in patients with heart failure. The topic is within the scope of the WJC. (1) **Classification**: Grade C; (2) **Summary of the Peer-Review Report**:

- The authors should better discuss about ARNI in the introduction section, some references should be updated, and some figure should be revised. At the same time, the questions raised by the reviewer should be answered;

Reply: Discussion points about ARNI have been added to the introduction, references have been updated and all questions have been addressed.

- and (3) **Format**: There are 3 tables and 6 figures. A total of 15 references are cited, including none of references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations.
- 2 **Language evaluation**: **Classification**: Grade C. Although some authors are from the United States, but the English of the paper should be revised by a native English speaker

Reply: The paper has been thoroughly revised by a native English speaker.

- 3 **Academic norms and rules**: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, and the PRISMA 2009 Checklist. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search.
- 4 **Supplementary comments**: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJC.
- 5 **Issues raised**: (1) The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions;

Reply: We have included the author contributorship statement to the manuscript.

- (2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

Reply: We have uploaded the original figure documents. These images were generated by the statistical software (RevMan). Unfortunately the images by itself are non-editable but they can be

reproduced and edited in the software. Please feel free to advise what editing is required or if different images are needed.

- (3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (4) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

Reply: We have listed PMID, DOI and all authors in references. We have also included “article highlights” section at the end of the main text

- 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(2) *Editorial Office Director*: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

(3) *Company Editor-in-Chief*: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report and the full text of the manuscript, of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revision. Before final acceptance, the authors need to meet language requirements by submitting the English Language Certificate. Please send the revised manuscript to the reviewer for a second round of peer review.

Thank you. The manuscript has been revised and edited by a native English speaker. I hope it now meets the standard of your journal. We have addressed all the concerns.

Thank you for these very astute observations and your kind consideration. Your suggestions have improved our manuscript. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you have any further concerns or questions, and we would be more than happy to address them.

Corresponding author:
Waqas Ullah