

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5405

Title: Comparative induction of controlled circulation by magnesium and remifentanil in spine surgery

Reviewer code: 00506135

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-09-05 11:39

Date reviewed: 2013-09-21 12:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- I recommend 'controlled hypotension' rather than 'controlled circulation'. - Method : Please describe on 'Likert scale' which was described in the discussion section. - Method : Was hypertension not included in exclusion criteria? - Method : Please include the power analysis if possible. - Please add the page number in the manuscript. - Discussion : Please explain the difference between magnesium sulfate and remifentanil in terms of the effects on cardiovascular system. - There are some typos : 'remifentanil', 'flowmetry' etc.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5405

Title: Comparative induction of controlled circulation by magnesium and remifentanyl in spine surgery

Reviewer code: 00505411

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-09-05 11:39

Date reviewed: 2013-09-27 10:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript is well prepared and well designed clinical trial. The study has been reviewed and approved by IRB and followed the ethical guidelines of human research. The only possible deficiency is the choice of remifentanyl for induced hypotension because this is not a commonly used hypotensive agent.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5405

Title: Comparative induction of controlled circulation by magnesium and remifentanyl in spine surgery

Reviewer code: 02281177

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-09-05 11:39

Date reviewed: 2013-09-27 14:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written paper. But sample size was small, in total only 39 patients were included in both groups. So few patients can obtain enough power for the clinical trial? In addition, authors should describe the randomized trial more detailedly.