

Review of: "The prevalence of malnutrition and its effects on the all-cause mortality among patients with heart failure: A systematic review and meta-analysis"

Jinyu Huang

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

To authors,

This study belongs to a meta-analysis, and the aim was to explore the prognosis of heart failure patients with malnutrition. However several issues limit this work.

- 1.The diagnostic criteria for chronic HF in this meta-analysis and all included studies need to be supplemented.
- 2.Different nutritional risk assessment tools were adopted in different studies, so clinical heterogeneity is evident, and so regardless of the results of the heterogeneity test, a random effects model should be chosen in the statistical description.
- 3.The authors included both prospective and retrospective studies, the level of evidence differed between the two types of studies, and this relevant sensitivity analyses need to be done.
- 4.Factors such as age and type of heart failure should be significant contributors to the outcomes in this analysis. Have these relevant subgroup analyses been done?
- 5.The authors assessed the quality of the studies by AHRQ and NOS, and the specific basis for obtaining scores for each study is suggested to be placed in the supplementary material.
- 6.The length of follow-up for each included study and other relevant baseline data need to be supplemented. The authors need to make the results of this study look more reliable.
- 7.As almost all of the included studies showed that heart failure combined with malnutrition is associated with higher all-cause mortality than non malnutrition, so the results of the meta-analysis are definitely the same, and this is not a controversial topic, what is the aim of the author's meta-analysis?

To editors,

Dear editors,

This is a meta-analysis on exploring the prognosis of heart failure patients with malnutrition. But neither appears to be very reliable methodologically nor as a result, mainly due to the insufficient strength of the available evidence. Moreover, almost all the studies included in this analysis presented " positive " results, so the current results of the present meta-analysis confer insufficient clinical value.

