

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12799

Title: Vasopressors in obstetrics: a current perspective

Reviewer code: 00506135

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-07-27 22:24

Date reviewed: 2014-08-07 14:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" 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"/> Existing	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is a well-written review article on the vasopressors for spinal anesthesia-induced hypotension in Cesarean section. The paper is well-organized and covers relevant recent publications.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12799

Title: Vasopressors in obstetrics: a current perspective

Reviewer code: 02453015

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-07-27 22:24

Date reviewed: 2014-07-28 00:01

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"/> Existing	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a comprehensive and neat review article regarding the application of vasopressors in obstetric surgeries. A table comparing the pros and cons of each drug, as well as a flow chart showing the choice of drug under each condition, are highly recommended. The authors also need to point out the benefit of their review article compared to other similar ones.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12799

Title: Vasopressors in obstetrics: a current perspective

Reviewer code: 00527225

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-07-27 22:24

Date reviewed: 2014-07-29 22:03

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"/> Existing	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The generic names of the drugs should not be capitalized. The inclusion of a figure demonstrating the mechanisms of spinal induced hypotension and perhaps a table evaluating the pros and cons of the vasopressor treatments on maternal and infants would be helpful.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12799

Title: Vasopressors in obstetrics: a current perspective

Reviewer code: 00742121

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-07-27 22:24

Date reviewed: 2014-08-01 04:23

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"/> Existing	<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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well-written review article suitable for publication after major revision, according to the following comments: 1) Title: The title should be changed to "Vasopressors in Obstetrical Anesthesia: a current perspective", since vasopressors are administered by Anesthetists rather than Obstetricians. 2) Running Title: The running title should be changed to "Vasopressors in Obstetrical Anesthesia", since it should not be identical to the main title ("a current perspective" should be removed from the running title). 3) Abstract, line 1: "counteract the hypotension" should be changed to "counteract hypotension". 4) Abstract, line 2: "obstetrics" should be changed to "Obstetrics". 5) Abstract, lines 6-8; Core tip, line 1; Conclusion, lines 1-2: The authors clearly express their preference for Phenylephrine over other vasopressors. However, as the authors discuss under the subheading "The Choice of Vasopressor: The recent evidence" (in pages 7-10) and at the end of the "Conclusion" section, the whole issue remains rather controversial. Actually, in many countries, Epinephrine remains the agent of choice. Hence, the authors should rephrase these sentences accordingly, in order to preserve objective presentation of their work. 6) Abstract line 6, Core tip line 3 and Conclusion lines 3, 4 and 13: "Cesareans" should be changed to "Cesarean sections". 7) Abstract line 7: The authors should provide more details about what sort of "indirect evidence" they mean. 8) Core tip, line 1: "obstetrics" should be changed to "Obstetrics". 9) Core tip, line 4: "to definitively suggest the benefit of..." should be rephrased (to e.g. "in order to clarify whether there is a benefit of..."). 10) Introduction, line 9: What do the authors mean by "dwelling"? 11) The authors mention spinal anesthesia throughout the

text (in line 2 of the Introduction, the last line of page 2, lines 11, 16 and 18 of page 3, lines 4 and 24 of page 4, line 5 and 16 of page 5, line 3 and last line of page 6, line 11 of page 7, line 1 of page 8, lines 17, 24 and 26 of page 9), but there is not a word about epidural anesthesia! 12) Page 3, lines 22 and 23: "obstetrics" should be changed by "Obstetrical Anesthesia". 13) Page 4, line 1: "It is an $\alpha 1$ receptor agonist which cause..." should be changed to "Methoxamine is an $\alpha 1$ receptor agonist which causes...". 14) Page 4, lines 2 and 16: "pressures" should be better changed to "pressure". 15) Page 6, lines 3-5: This paragraph should be re-phrased and written in more proper English. 16) Page 6, lines 11-12: A paragraph should include at least two sentences (not one sentence in just one paragraph). 17) Page 6, line 15: "Recent studies..." should be changed to "A recent study...". 18) Page 6, line 21: "...evade the obstetric anesthesiologist..." should be rephrased. What do the authors actually mean? 19) Page 8, line 21: "The National..." should be changed to "The UK National...". 20) Page 8, line 23: "obstetrics" should be changed to "Obstetrical Anesthesia". 21) Page 9, lines 8-10: A paragraph should include at least two sentences (not one sentence in just one paragraph). 22) Page 10, last three lines: The authors should specify how "larger trials, especially in non-elective" Cesarean sections should be conducted. Non-elective cesarean sections are performed based on certain indications; how should cesarean sections and cesarean section indications should be classified in such trials? 23) A "conflict of interest statement" should be included. 24) The authors should provide an overview of information given for each vasopressor in a Table.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS manuscript NO: 12799

Title: Vasopressors in obstetrics: a current perspective

Reviewer code: 00742261

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-07-27 22:24

Date reviewed: 2014-08-01 04:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Svein Rasmussen This is a valuable contribution. I have only some minor remarks. The authors use the slang term ?cesarean? instead of cesarean delivery or section. Page 2: "This review article briefly explores the present understanding of the mechanism causing hypotension before dwelling on the current use of the various vasopressors in obstetrics today.": This sentence should be made more understandable. Page 2: "The sympathectomy resulting from the neuraxial blockade ...": Rather "chemical sympathectomy". Page 3: "Although this understanding of hypotension still remains "current"6, prophylactic therapeutic interventions based upon our present understanding do not definitively prevent hypotension after neuraxial anaesthesia in Cesarean sections6.": The sentence should be made easier to understand. Page 3: "The "endothelium-dependent alteration of vascular smooth muscle function"6 and increased presence of "vasodilator prostaglandins and nitric oxide"6 during pregnancy have a vasodilatory effect which is counteracted by the intrinsic sympathetic vascular tone6": The quotation marks are unnecessary. Page 6: "Recent studies by Siddik-Sayyid et al.31 failed ..": "A recent study" seems to be more correct. Page 9: "... APGAR". "Apgar" is more correct.