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Reviewer's report:

Bose et al., have proposed a protocol for systematic review investigating direct oral anticoagulants (DOAC) use in the cerebral venous thrombosis (CVT). The authors aim to assess the effectiveness and safety of DOAC's in patients with cerebral vein thrombosis to help guide clinical decision making and to direct future studies.

The authors have done an excellent job in writing the manuscript.

Following are my comments and suggestions to the authors,

1. Background: page 4

Rationale:

For the adults with symptomatic CVT, the initial anticoagulation therapy is with subcutaneous low molecular weight heparin (LMWH) or intravenous heparin. After the acute phase of CVT, anticoagulation with vitamin K antagonist, warfarin recommended. The authors should mention this current treatment approach in their manuscript and clarify whether they are investigating the use of DOAC's in Acute CVT or post-acute phase, i.e., for long term CVT?

2. Methods: Page 5

- Studies to be included must be written in either English or French? Why is this a criterion? Any reason the authors don't want to add Chinese, Japanese, Spanish and other major language studies in the review.

- Under information sources, authors need to update the manuscript to include the end of search date from September 2017 to current time (December 2018/January 2019).

3. Discussion:
The authors of the ongoing RCT (RE-SPECT CVT) from Europe (ClinicalTrials.gov number: NCT02913326) comparing dabigatran with dose-adjusted warfarin in 120 patients with CVT or dural sinus thrombosis for the prevention of recurrent venous thrombotic event are about to publish results by the end of this year, (1). Given the timing, do authors plan to include this RCT in their systematic review?
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