

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75849
Title of the Manuscript:	Transfusion Triggers in Cardiac Surgery Patients – A Retrospective Review.
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>This study describes a sample of 100 patients from a single cardiac surgery center and aims to determine the transfusion trigger for cardiac surgery patients and to determine the transfusion pattern in these patients.</p> <p>Some negative points and questions to be answered are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its limitation is the fact that it is retrospective and observational, which increases some types of bias; • it did not take into account the surgical complications and survival rate of the patients described, nor did it relate these variables to PRBC transfusions; • larger procedures, with greater surgical trauma and with the use of cardiopulmonary bypass (CABG, valve replacements, for example), cannot be compared with smaller procedures (hemothorax and pyothorax, for example), mainly due to the effects of cardiopulmonary bypass on different organ systems and mainly on blood clotting; • better describe the relationship between O2 supply and utilization and PRBC transfusions; • conduct a literature review with more recent works (<i>Mazer, CD et. al</i> and <i>Murphy, GJ et. al</i>, both from <i>The New England Journal of Medicine</i> and <i>Koch, CG et. al</i>, from <i>The Annals of Thoracic Surgery</i>, 2017); • I also suggest an analysis of the hematocrit, not only of the hemoglobin concentrations, as some major studies in this field have been doing; • how was the ethical approval obtained? Have all patients agreed to participate in the study?; • the aims of the study are not answered in the conclusion. Levels of Hb (7 and 10) are used in the studies used by the authors so they did not determine the transfusion trigger as described in the aim section. <p>I recommend a serious major revision. I do not have any competing interest. Ethical issues are in the reviewer's comment.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Ethical issues must be better answered (see reviewer's comments)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonardo Rufino Garcia
Department, University & Country	Universidade Estadual Paulista – UNESP, Brazil