

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 4844

**Title:** Comparison of Flow Rate Accuracy and Consistency between the On-Q, Baxter, and Ambu Pain Infusion Devices

**Reviewer code:** 00506041

**Science editor:** Wang, Jin-Lei

**Date sent for review:** 2013-07-26 14:07

**Date reviewed:** 2013-07-27 09:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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**

This is a valuable investigation about three modern, single use elastomeric infusion devices. The finding of significant alterations in flow rate than their set nominal delivery volume among the three devices may provide clinical reference for physicians. Although this is a well-written manuscript, there are some minor errors as following: 1) The cited reference 12 in Result section couldn't find in References List. 2) Please provide the Legend for Figure 1.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 4844

**Title:** Comparison of Flow Rate Accuracy and Consistency between the On-Q, Baxter, and Ambu Pain Infusion Devices

**Reviewer code:** 00506006

**Science editor:** Wang, Jin-Lei

**Date sent for review:** 2013-07-26 14:07

**Date reviewed:** 2013-07-28 03:00

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

I read the paper on the performance of the different pumps with great interest, and I do consider the paper of clinical relevance. I only suggest to include some quantitative data in the abstract in addition to (or instead of) quantitative data.

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 4844

**Title:** Comparison of Flow Rate Accuracy and Consistency between the On-Q, Baxter, and Ambu Pain Infusion Devices

**Reviewer code:** 00338315

**Science editor:** Wang, Jin-Lei

**Date sent for review:** 2013-07-26 14:07

**Date reviewed:** 2013-08-06 00:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ Y] Grade A (Excellent)	[ Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

ref. 12 was missed ligand of figure 1 was missed