

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Critical Care Medicine*

**Manuscript NO:** 67689

**Title:** Point of Care Venous Doppler Ultrasound: Exploring the Missing Piece of Bedside Hemodynamic Assessment

**Reviewer's code:** 05648950

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-06 09:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-19 10:23

**Review time:** 13 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1. What is the meaning of over jealous volume removal ? could you explain or clarify
- 2.It was stated that in cardiac surgery patients, altered intra-renal Doppler pattern was shown to be a strong predictor of AKI. However, this was not replicated in less selected populations of critically ill patients, can you further explain the reason for this findings.
3. It was stated that Doppler Evaluation of venous congestion can point to renal congestion as the cause of renal hypoperfusion, could you give detail information and explanation on this statement
4. Also, I suggest superior venacava assessment of congestion could be included in this review.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Critical Care Medicine*

**Manuscript NO:** 67689

**Title:** Point of Care Venous Doppler Ultrasound: Exploring the Missing Piece of Bedside Hemodynamic Assessment

**Reviewer's code:** 05759634

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Research Fellow

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-06 05:38

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-27 02:18

**Review time:** 20 Days and 20 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I am grateful for the opportunity to review this interesting manuscript about the Doppler ultrasonography applications for the evaluation of venous congestion in the bedside context. The paper is well-written, the topic is of clinical interest and good figures are included. I only suggest the following minor revisions: - In the “Normal Venous Doppler flow patterns” paragraph a better description of the venous waveform morphology is needed; in particular, authors should report the three main venous flow patterns: respirophasic, continuous and pulsatile. - As for central veins, the authors reported only inferior vena cava evaluation; in this regard, I suggest including internal jugular assessment for the hemodynamic status of congestive patients. - I really appreciate the description of the “pulsatility fraction” as a quantitative marker of portal vein Doppler alterations, so I suggest including the “venous impedance index” for the assessment of Doppler renal venous flow. - I recommend including a table depicting the advantages and limitations of the different sonographic venous flow patterns depending on the different sites you described in the manuscript.