

## **ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Anesthesiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29890

**Title:** Massive Transfusion: An Update for the Anesthesiologist

**Reviewer's code:** 00054120

### **COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

An excellent review of massive transfusion protocols with added information from the experience of the authors at their institution. The review covered mostly trauma victims across the adult and pediatric population and with short review for obstetric bleeding. The paper is well written with very informative details which can be of value for the anesthesiologists, however, I would like to see at least a short and review for massive transfusion in cases other than trauma, such as ruptured aortic aneurysm and bleeding from esophageal varices in cirrhotic patients both we see many of these cases and they do need particulate attention to correct the hemostatic disturbances that caused by massive bleeding in patients with pre-existing multiple co-morbidities.

### **AUTHOR RESPONSE TO REVIEWER #1:**

Thank you for your comments. As trauma surgeons, we do not participate in the resuscitation of ruptured AAA or esophageal varices patients and cannot comment on those specific patient populations. However, the general principles discussed in our article can be applied to any bleeding patient.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Anesthesiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29890

**Title:** Massive Transfusion: An Update for the Anesthesiologist

**Reviewer's code:** 00506051

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The manuscript is well written and deserves publication 2. It needs minor language polishing, there are few repeated words and several minor mistakes 3. A number of grammatical errors are present in the whole manuscript needing corrections. 4. There are few minor mistakes i.e. "MTP protocols" must be replaced with "MT protocols" 5. A, B, C is used twice with different meaning - Assessment of Blood Consumption on p. 4, and roles of three persons A,B,C) in the Fig. 1. 6. The paper otherwise good.

### AUTHOR RESPONSE TO REVIEWER #1:

We appreciate your input, especially in numbering your list. In response to #4, the article has been reviewed and any usage of "MTP protocols" has been adjusted. In response to #5, this has been corrected. Thank you again.