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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed a pertinent question that has a practical implication.

• Major Compulsory Revisions
  o Page 5, line 120: Please elaborate the statistical analysis specifically how did you perform the systematic review.

• Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract:
Section Results/line 37: Please rephrase the line ‘45 had CVT (7.5%), one had a negative D-dimer.’ to make the message more clear. Also for line ‘Sensitivity was 97.8% (95%CI: 88.2%-99.6%), specificity was 84.9% 38 (95%CI: 81.8%-87.7%), positive predictive value was 33.1% (95%CI: 25.2%-41.7%), negative predictive value 39 was 99.8% (95%CI: 98.9%-100%’), please add sensitivity of d dimer for diagnosing CVT was....

Background:
Page 3, line 62: please briefly elaborate wells score for readers who are unfamiliar with this scoring system.
Page 3, line 71: please rephrase the line ‘In patients71 with a high clinical suspicion of CVT neuro-imaging should be performed regardless of D-dimer results according to American guidelines’ and start it with ‘According to American guidelines for CVT, .....’
Page 3 line 75: Please replace ‘few’ with ‘limited’ in the line ‘There are conflicting and few data on patients with isolated headache’.

• Discretionary Revisions
None

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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