

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8296

Title: Newer methods of Cardiac Output Monitoring

Reviewer code: 00225357

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2013-12-25 12:22

Date reviewed: 2013-12-27 22:13

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The aim of the present review is not clear: it is a list of conventional and more contemporary methods to assess CO. Originality is low but the main factor lacking is a balance of advantages and disadvantages of each method. The topic is superficially discussed and all the information given is not put into clinical context. Authors never tell us which method they use and why; what is needed besides what we have. It is interesting to note that authors discuss TEE but not TTE which allows, with limitations, the measure of CO. A table with pros and cons would help the reader.

ESPS Peer-review Report**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Cardiology**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8296**Title:** Newer methods of Cardiac Output Monitoring**Reviewer code:** 00608247**Science editor:** Su-Xin Gou**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-25 12:22**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-29 23:14

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

The authors reviewed new technology in invasive and non invasive cardiac output measurement. The article is well written and very useful for our readers.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Cardiology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8296

Title: Newer methods of Cardiac Output Monitoring

Reviewer code: 00211910

Science editor: Su-Xin Gou

Date sent for review: 2013-12-25 12:22

Date reviewed: 2014-01-11 09:46

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 checked="" 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

The authors tried to review the clinical methods of cardiac output monitoring. There are some minor deficiencies: 1. Some spelling errors, e.g. catheter (page 2, line 5). Therefore, English editing is necessary. 2. A table is necessary to summarize the methods to monitor cardiac output. For readers, the advantages and disadvantages can be clearly displayed.