

Review of: "Fluids, Vasopressors and Inotropes to Restore Heart-Vessels Coupling in Sepsis: Treatment Options and Perspectives"

Dorin Dragos¹

¹ Carol Davila University of Medicine and Pharmacy

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper might be a useful contribution to the role of fluid resuscitation, vasopressors, and inotropes in septic patients. The two cases are remarkably unremarkable, but they might be useful for beginners in their first month of medical practice in the emergency department.

The first case presentation lacks logical coherence and continuity:

We are told: "and hemodynamic stability was restored" - but nothing was said previously about the patient being hemodynamically unstable; on the contrary, there was nothing remarkable on physical examination, according to the authors.

"Empiric antibiotic treatment was begun" - on what basis? Nothing was said about blood tests (prosepsin, procalcitonin, neutrophil count) that might suggest bacterial infection.

What do the authors mean by "interstitial syndrome"?

In Table 1, the legend of the table should clarify the meaning of T0 and T1.

The English is bad, and not infrequently quite hilarious; here are only a few among many examples:

"with several points that"

"showed no remarks on physical examination"

"and at 24 hours, the patient presented hypotensive"

"failure to obtain a stable hemodynamic"

"the evidence" - the noun evidence is uncountable

"real advantages or damages of this practice"

"in actuality"

"as regards to the administration"

"who reach the hemodynamic stability"