

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-21-782>

Reviewer 1:

Comment 1: Abstract: Would be good to have brief introduction about of the two types of injection examined to justify the importance of the topic.

Reply 1: As Reviewer suggested that we added brief introduction about safflower yellow pigment and Sanqi Panax Notoginseng injection to describe the two injections.

Changes in the text: We added the introduction in the Abstract.(see Page 2, line 32-34)

Comment 2: More information about the methods is needed, including the eligibility criteria of the included studies, no. of databases searched, language of the studies searched.

Reply 2: It is really true as Reviewer suggested that we should add more information about the methods. We added the brief eligibility criteria of the included studies, no. of databases searched, language of the studies searched in the Abstract, methods.

Changes in the text: We added the information in the Methods.(see Page 2, line 39-42)

Comment 3: Information about methodological quality appraisal of the included studies should be included in the results.

Reply 3: Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have added the information about methodological quality appraisal of the included 12 studies.

Changes in the text: We added the information in the Results.(see Page 2, line 49-50)

Comment 4: Elaborate on the outcome of effectiveness, and the full term of ICER, and the adverse reactions.

Reply 4: Considering the Reviewer's suggestion, we have added the information about the outcome of effectiveness, and the full term of ICER has been stated in the original text (see Page 2, line 46). Meanwhile, we only briefly described the adverse reactions of two injections. And there was limited literature reporting adverse events of two injections in the included studies. So we didn't add the outcome of the adverse reactions.

Changes in the text: We added the information in the Results.(see Page 2, line 51-52)

Comment 5: Manuscript:Background: more information about the two types of injection e.g. its application, studies about its usage, administration would be helpful.

Reply 5: As Reviewer suggested that we added introduction (its application in hospital, studies about its usage)about safflower yellow pigment and Sanqi Panax Notoginseng injection to describe the two injections.

Changes in the text: We added the information in the Introduction.(see Page 5, line

89-92)

Comment 6: Unclear sentence in line 77-79, probably some grammatical errors in comparing ‘them’ and ‘pharmacoeconomic research’?

Reply 6: We are very sorry for our incorrect writing. We have modified our text.

Changes in the text: We have modified our text in the Introduction.(see Page 5, line 92-94)

Comment 7: Aim: the aim needs to be revised, as the current aim seems to be relevant to the aim of a clinical trial. For systematic review and meta-analysis, it would be better to reword as ‘to review the current evidence on ...’.

Reply 7: It is really true as Reviewer suggested that we revised the beginning of the aim as the sentence “The aim of this paper was to review the current evidence on...”

Changes in the text: We have modified our text in the Aim of Introduction.(see Page 5, line 94)

Comment 8: Line 91-93: it would be good to identify the databases searched as Chinese or English databases, use full term for VIP. The databases searched were not comprehensive enough for a systematic review. More bibliographic databases and for searching for grey literatures, and ongoing trials should also be searched. Explanation should be provided for searching only the articles published between 2006 and 2019.

Reply 8: It is really true as Reviewer suggested that the database should be classified as Chinese and English. And more searching methods should be reported such as searching for grey literatures and ongoing trials.

Changes in the text: We have classified the databases into Chinese and English. We also added other searching methods as the reviewers suggested. Searching only the articles published between 2006 and 2019 is according to the PROSPERO registration. (see Page 5-6, line 108-116)

Comment 9: Line 99-112: The eligibility criteria should be reframed according to PICO. The Sanqi Panax Notoginseng injection should be the comparison intervention, or would be consider comparing with usual care?

Reply 9: We are very sorry for our unreasonable reporting format. We have reported this section according to the PICOS.

Changes in the text: The previous eligibility criteria section was reported according to PICOS, and the title was changed to “Study selection”. (see Page 6, line 119-133)

Comment 10: Line 108-109: this sentence can be deleted.

Reply 10: We are very sorry for using this sentence without practical use.

Changes in the text: We have deleted this sentence.

Comment 11:Line 156-157: grammatical errors, and some info is duplicated.

Reply 11: We are very sorry for this grammatical error.

Changes in the text: We have deleted some duplicated information.(see Page 8, line 176)

Comment 12:Line 172: Effectiveness – The neurological deficit score should be explicit. It is unclear about the meaning of ‘effective rate of treatment’. Should it be the decrease in the level of NIHSS or else? Could elaborate on what efficiency index.

Reply 12: We are very sorry for missing to report the meaning of ‘effective rate of treatment’ and we should report the efficiency index in detail as the Review suggested.

Changes in the text: We reported our outcome indicator in detail and explained what it meant(see Page 6, line 123-130)

Comment 13:Line 178: More information about how to judge the score and effectiveness on what aspect.

Reply 13: It is really true as Reviewer suggested that we neglected to report the information about how to judge the score and effectiveness on what aspect.

Changes in the text: We explained how to judge the score and effectiveness. (see Page 9, line 198-199)

Comment 14:Line 187: types – initially, identified, duplicated

Reply 14: It is really true as Reviewer suggested that we should report this section in detail.

Changes in the text: We reported the initially, identified, duplicated number in detail in this section.(see Page 9, line 207)

Comment 15:Line 191: could summarise the reasons for exclusion

Reply 15: It is really true as Reviewer suggested that we should summarise the reasons for exclusion instead of neglecting them.

Changes in the text: We added the reasons for exclusion in detail.(see Page 9-10, line 211-212)

Comment 16:Line 198: A summary of the included studies characteristics could be described. The summary of the results of the methodological quality appraisal is needed.

Reply 16: We are very sorry for not reporting the summary of the results of the methodological quality.

Changes in the text: We added a sentence to report the summary of the results of the methodological quality.(see Page 10, line 221-222)

Comment 17:Line 230: unclear meaning for ‘effective rate’. Revising the wordings to make it clearer is needed.

Reply 17: We are very sorry for missing to explain the meaning of “effective rate”.

Changes in the text: We have changed “effective rate” to “total effective rate” and the meaning in detail was reported in section “study selection”.(see Page 12, line 264)

Comment 18:Line 243: could describe as ‘included studies’ instead of ‘literatures’

Reply 18: We are very sorry for using a unreasonable word.

Changes in the text: We have changed the word “literatures” into “studies” and polished the language.(see Page 12, line 281)

Comment 19: Discussion: The discussion on the results is limited, and more like repeating the description of the results. More discussion on the consistency of the results obtained with previous published studies and the implications in future research and practice could be included.

Reply 19: We have re-written this part according to the Reviewer’s suggestion. We have carefully modified the discussion about the perspective of pharmacoeconomics according to previous published studies to identify the cost-effectiveness and pharmacoeconomics between the two injections.

Changes in the text: We added the information in the Discussion.(see Page 17, line 398-403)

Comment 20: Quite a lot of grammatical errors and would be helpful to proofread the manuscript.

Reply 20: The language of our paper is polished by a native speaker and modified all the grammatical errors.

Changes in the text: Language polish can be seen through the review mode of Word documents in the marked manuscript.