

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13832

**Title:** Arginine vasopressin as a target in the treatment of acute heart failure

**Reviewer code:** 00502903

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-09-04 11:32

**Date reviewed:** 2014-09-14 13:22

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 very well-written review of the vaptan class of pharmaceuticals. I have only 2 comments. 1. p.6, "More recent trials have demonstrated similar safety endpoints however to clear benefit to nesiritide therapy." Please clarify this sentence. Do you mean, "More recent trials have demonstrated similar safety endpoints, but no clear benefit to nesiritide therapy." 2. p.10, last sentence, should read "when compared to a V2 selective antagonist, increased the first derivative..." (not decreased)

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Cardiology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13832

**Title:** Arginine vasopressin as a target in the treatment of acute heart failure

**Reviewer code:** 00227654

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-09-04 11:32

**Date reviewed:** 2014-09-11 01:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] 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 review is timely and well written, providing a comprehensive and succinct clinical review. Minor point - please rewrite final sentence of Conclusions section - it is confusing as currently written.