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Reviewer's report:

The Authors state that since there are no guidelines that focus specifically on cancer treatment-induced cardiotoxicity, they conducted a meta-review of the systematic reviews and meta-analyses that have addressed this important issue. Their stated aim was to appraise and synthesise the systematic reviews that have focused on the prevention, early detection and management of cancer treatment-induced cardiotoxicity in order to aid policy and practice decision-making. Using Cochrane methodology, the Authors searched databases, citations and hand-searched bibliographies. Two reviewers independently appraised reviews and extracted findings. A total of 18 high quality systematic reviews were subsequently analysed, 67% (n=12) of these comprised meta-analyses. Results were reported.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Unfortunately, this review will require reconciliation of the problem statement with the published ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines that in 2012 were published as a result of a multidisciplinary cardio-oncology review of current evidence with the ultimate goal of providing strict criteria-based recommendations on CV risk prevention, assessment, monitoring and management during anticancer treatment.

There are other issues with the results presented. First, all 18 reviews should be listed in a table for the readers. Second, I find any firmly stated conclusions based on a single systematic review to be troubling. The Authors concluded from a single review that cardiac biomarkers do not detect cardiotoxicity although admittedly the evidence for this was poor. It is also clear that much of what is contained in this paper is limited to review of analyses based on 7 to 6 year old data sets.

Minor Essential Revisions

Minor issues include the use of terms like dose-dense (does this mean bolus?), the lack of detail and the use of opinion as fact (examples on page 16; “two different interventions” What were they? and “it is the rate of heart failure that is most informative” Opinion?).

As a result of these limitations, correction of these deficiencies will be required before further consideration of the publication.
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