Reviewer's report

Title: Enhanced external counterpulsation in treatment of refractory angina pectoris: two year outcome and baseline factors associated with treatment failure

Version: 1 Date: 16 June 2008

Reviewer: Elizabeth D Kennard

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions: none

Minor Essential Revisions: In the statistical section (page 7) the expression 'risk for mass significance...' should be explained better.

As response to treatment is defined as reduction by at least one angina class it would be better to express the long term results in a similar fashion, rather than as mean angina class. Results should be expressed maybe as percentage of patients still showing response compared to pre-treatment. Mean angina class is not really meaningful.

Discretionary Revisions: It would be interesting to know what happened to the patients who relapsed during the follow-up period and had to have further EECP treatment. Did they respond again to the treatment so that they had a reduction of angina at the end of two years?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

Coordinator of the International EECP Patient Registry which was funded through a grant by Vasomedical Inc. to the University of Pittsburgh.