

Decision Letter (JCQ-2024-0023)

From:

To:

CC:

BCC:

Subject: Journal of Clinical Question - Decision on Manuscript ID JCQ-2024-0023

Body: 23-Mar-2025

Dear Dr Yu,

Manuscript ID JCQ-2024-0023 entitled "Efficacy and Safety of MitraClip for Secondary Mitral Regurgitation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials" which you submitted to the Journal of Clinical Question, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To submit your revised manuscript, follow the below steps.

1. Access to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jcq> and log into the site.
2. Click "Author" at the top left of the screen at "Home" page.
3. Click "Manuscripts with Decisions" on Author Dashboard page.
4. Click "create a revision" on the manuscript you are going to revise.
5. The system creates your revision manuscript form. Provide your comments about the revised points at the response field, fill in on each field step by step as same as you did for the original submission, and submit your revised manuscript.

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission. Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Journal of Clinical Question, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Journal of Clinical Question and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,
Professor EIC JCQ
Editor in Chief, Journal of Clinical Question
jcqeic@gleampub.com

[Editor's Comments]
Associate Editor
Comments to the Author:
(There are no comments.)

[Reviewer(s)' Comments]

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

Very well structured and comprehensive review article. Offers valuable insights on secondary mitral regurgitation and mitraclip, connecting also and with the right timing regarding publication of RESHAPE HF2 and MATTERHORN.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

If I have understood, the aim of the study is the comparison of mitraclip vs surgery in secondary MR. Anyway, among the RCT considered, only two are coherent with the premise (MATTEHORN and EVEREST II). The other three study compare mitraclip vs optimal medical therapy. Moreover EVEREST II population was 75% primary MR, with normal volumes and LVEF. The intention of the Authors is interesting, but method is incorrect.

Date Sent: 23-Mar-2025



Print



Close Window

Author's Response to Decision Letter for (JCQ-2024-0023)

Efficacy and Safety of MitraClip for Secondary Mitral Regurgitation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials

We sincerely thank the reviewers and editors for their thoughtful and constructive feedback on our manuscript. We have carefully addressed each comment and revised the manuscript accordingly. Below are our detailed responses to each point raised.

Reviewer: 1

Very well structured and comprehensive review article. Offers valuable insights on secondary mitral regurgitation and mitraclip, connecting also and with the right timing regarding publication of RESHAPE HF2 and MATTERHORN.

Response: Thank you very much for your kind words and positive feedback. We're glad to hear that you found the review well-structured and insightful.

Reviewer: 2

If I have understood, the aim of the study is the comparison of mitraclip vs surgery in secondary MR. Anyway, among the RCT considered, only two are coherent with the premise (MATTEHORN and EVEREST II). The other three study compare mitraclip vs optimal medical therapy. Moreover EVEREST II population was 75% primary MR, with normal volumes and LVEF. The intention of the Authors is interesting, but method is incorrect.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer's insightful comment on this important point. We acknowledge a significant oversight in our original selection of control groups. First, we have excluded the EVEREST II study from our analysis, as data specific to secondary MR could not be reliably extracted. Second, we have reclassified the remaining four RCTs into appropriate subgroups based on their comparators—optimal medical therapy and surgical intervention—and performed subgroup analyses accordingly. We have revised all corresponding results and updated the manuscript throughout to reflect these changes. Thank you again for your valuable feedback.

Once again, we thank the reviewers for their time and thoughtful comments, which have significantly improved the clarity and quality of our manuscript. We hope the revised version meets your expectations and are happy to respond to any further queries.

Best Regards

Zaiqiang Yu

Department of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, Hirosaki University



1. [Response Letter.pdf](#). [PDF](#)

Decision Letter (JCQ-2024-0023.R1)

From: [REDACTED]
To: yuzaiqiang@hirosaki-u.ac.jp
CC: yuzaiqiang@hirosaki-u.ac.jp
BCC:

Subject: Journal of Clinical Question - Decision on Manuscript ID JCQ-2024-0023.R1
Body: 22-Apr-2025

Dear Dr Yu,

Manuscript ID JCQ-2024-0023.R1 entitled "Efficacy and Safety of MitraClip for Secondary Mitral Regurgitation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials" which you submitted to the Journal of Clinical Question, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To submit your revised manuscript, follow the below steps.

1. Access to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jcq> and log into the site.
2. Click "Author" at the top left of the screen at "Home" page.
3. Click "Manuscripts with Decisions" on Author Dashboard page.
4. Click "create a revision" on the manuscript you are going to revise.
5. The system creates your revision manuscript form. Provide your comments about the revised points at the response field, fill in on each field step by step as same as you did for the original submission, and submit your revised manuscript.

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission. Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Journal of Clinical Question, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Journal of Clinical Question and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,
Professor Richard Isaacs
Editor in Chief, Journal of Clinical Question
jcqeic@gleampub.com

[Editor's Comments]
Associate Editor
Comments to the Author:
(There are no comments.)

[Reviewer(s)' Comments]
Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author
Congratulations about your interesting paper and effort. Minor revisions should be done, though. In reference 1, "Barsouk A" is listed twice, which may be an error unless the author contributed in two distinct roles.
The citation for the University Hospital Medical Information Network (reference 14) lacks proper formatting and details, such as the title of the study and publication year. The DOI for the ACC/AHA guideline (reference 8) is listed as "doi:doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000923," which appears to be a typographical error. Some references include full journal names (e.g., reference 1), while others use abbreviations (e.g., reference 4). Consistency in formatting is essential. The title mentioned in reference 14 ("Middle meningeal artery embolization in subdural hematoma") does not align with the context of the study, which focuses on mitral regurgitation. References such as 21 and 22 lack volume and issue numbers, which are typically included in journal citations. Thank you.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author
This version is better than before.
There are still errors.
1. Pag 7 Search strategy: to identify RCTs comparing MitraClip with surgical intervention... ADD: or medical therapy
2. Recurrence of MR: you say three RCTs vs surgery. Incorrect: two vs medical therapy and one vs surgery. MitraClip is superior to medical therapy in recurrence of MR but is at least the same versus surgery (in MATTERHORN 7 vs 1 events).
3. The same in functional improvements; two studies vs med and 1 vs surgery. MitraClip superior to med in NYHA improvements and no differences vs surgery.

Date Sent: 22-Apr-2025

Author's Response to Decision Letter for (JCQ-2024-0023.R1)

Efficacy and Safety of MitraClip for Secondary Mitral Regurgitation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials

Dear Reviewers,

We sincerely thank the reviewers for their thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which have significantly improved the quality and clarity of our manuscript. Below, we provide detailed responses to each point raised by Reviewer 1 and Reviewer 2. All changes made in response to the comments are clearly marked in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer: 1

Comment 1: In reference 1, "Barsouk A" is listed twice, which may be an error unless the author contributed in two distinct roles.

Response: We appreciate your attention to detail. Upon review, we found that the authors Adam Barsouk and Alexander Barsouk were both included, and due to the AMA 11th edition formatting guidelines, their names were abbreviated identically as "Barsouk A." We have clarified this point in the reference to avoid confusion.

Comment 2: The citation for the University Hospital Medical Information Network (reference 14) lacks proper formatting and details, such as the title of the study and publication year. The title mentioned ("Middle meningeal artery embolization in subdural hematoma") does not align with the study's actual focus on mitral regurgitation.

Response: Thank you for pointing this out. We have corrected reference 14 to reflect the accurate title, registration number, and year of publication. The previous title was mistakenly included and has now been replaced to align with the mitral regurgitation study.

Comment 3: The DOI for the ACC/AHA guideline (reference 8) is listed as "doi:doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000923," which appears to be a typographical error.

Response: We appreciate your observation. The typographical error has been corrected to "doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000923."

Comment 4: Consistency in formatting is essential. Some references include full journal names (e.g., reference 1), while others use abbreviations (e.g., reference 4).

Response: Thank you for this helpful suggestion. We have reviewed and standardized all references to ensure consistent use of journal names, formatting, and punctuation in accordance with the journal's citation style.

Comment 5: References such as 21 and 22 lack volume and issue numbers, which are typically included in journal citations.

Response: We appreciate your comment. The missing volume and issue numbers, as well as page ranges for references 21 and 22, have now been added.

Reviewer: 2

Comment 1: Page 7, Search Strategy: The phrase should be revised to include "or medical therapy" in addition to surgical intervention.

Response: Thank you for the comment. We have revised the sentence to read: "to identify RCTs comparing MitraClip with surgical or medical interventions."

Comment 2: Recurrence of MR: You state there were three RCTs comparing MitraClip to surgery, but this is incorrect. Two studies compared MitraClip to medical therapy and one to surgery. MitraClip is superior to medical therapy but equivalent to surgery (e.g., 7 vs 1 events in MATTERHORN).

Response: We appreciate this correction. The sentence has been revised to: "Three studies evaluated the risk of recurrence of Grade 3+ or 4+ MR after treatment with MitraClip compared to either medical or surgical therapy. MitraClip was superior to medical therapy, whereas its efficacy was comparable to surgery (e.g., 7 vs. 1 events in MATTERHORN)."

Comment 3: Functional improvement: Two studies compared MitraClip with medical therapy, and one with surgery. MitraClip was superior to medical therapy for NYHA improvement but not significantly different from surgery.

Response: Thank you for your observation. We have clarified the sentence as follows: "Three studies assessed the effect of MitraClip on improving NYHA functional class I/II compared to either medical or surgical treatments. MitraClip was associated with greater functional improvement compared to medical therapy, with no significant difference compared to surgery."

We greatly appreciate the reviewers' time and effort in evaluating our manuscript. We believe that the revisions have strengthened the manuscript considerably. We hope that the revised version meets the expectations of the reviewers and the editorial team, and we look forward to your favorable consideration for publication.

Sincerely,

Zaiqiang Yu

Department of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, Hirosaki University

Tel: 0172-33-5111

Fax: 0172-37-8340

Email: yuzaiqiang@hirosaki-u.ac.jp

1. [Response Letter.pdf](#) [PDF](#)