Review of: "Impact of medical, surgical and expectant management on spontaneous miscarriage/abortion on first trimester: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized, controlled trials"

Conrado Ragazini[1]

1 Clinics Hospital of Ribeirão Preto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The review is about an important topic, congratulations on your work.

First of all, the text needs some minor grammar/spelling corrections. For example, the term “PRISMA” on the abstract, is spelled PRISAM. Please, go through the text once more and review these minor points. Attention to some edition issues - for example, it has turned I^2 into I[2] (as if this 2 was a reference). This should also be corrected.

One minor point on results section (3.) is that, since there is a table describing the included studies, there is no need to cite them individually on the first paragraph. However, for clarity, if you still wish to do that, you could shorten that to [22]-[42].

Finally, the major concern on this paper is on section 3.3. There are three statements that need to be corrected:

- “The studies showed that risk of abdominal pain was higher in medical when compared to surgical (OR: 3.04 [2.19, 4.23]) **and expectant management (OR: 1.18 [0.50, 2.81])**”
- “The studies showed that risk of vaginal bleeding was higher in expectant group when compared with surgical (OR: 2.62 [1.33, 5.18]) or **medical (OR: 1.84 [0.97, 3.51])**”
- “The rate of infection is higher in the surgical group when compared to medical (OR: 2.55 [1.36, 4.78]) and **expectant group (OR: 1.25 [0.63, 2.48])**”

The results highlighted in bold letters are not correctly described. Since all of their confidence intervals (CI) cross the unity (1), no differences between groups can be stated, because the true value could be 1. One could say that, when compared with vaginal bleeding, expectant treatment PROBABLY has a higher risk of bleeding – because the CI is majorly above one – but there is always a chance of both groups being equal in this outcome. The forest plot of these 3 comparisons show very clearly this absence of difference.

Since these results – and subsequential conclusions – are important in decision-making, I'd avise to publishing this paper only after corrections have been made.