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Reviewer's report:

It is not clear why and how the authors would perform the systematic review.

WHY?

The aim of the study is not clear. From the abstract it seems that the aim was to collect evidence of reported safety and efficacy of DOAC. One would expect that these evidence would be used for guidelines. From the introduction it seems that data would be used for standardising dosage etc. for prospective trial. From the method section it seems that data will be used for designing future studies, this sounds more like methodological designing (line 159). I don't see how all these information would help in designing future studies, as the main problem is the recruitment due to the rarity of the CVT.

In the introduction Heparin or VKA were also mentioned in details, and one would expect that these treatment modalities would also be compared.

HOW?

The language restriction is a major limitation. The authors should include all relevant papers. Even other language papers do have an abstract and/or title in English.

DOAC was introduced in 2010. Why do the authors include papers from 1946? And why are papers from 2018 not included?

Which of the prisma checklist would be used?

Important details in the method sections are missing. E.g. inclusion criteria, outcomes, tools for bias, data synthesis. This is my major concern. It does not seems that the authors do have a plan in details.
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