Reviewer's report

Title: Enteral nutrition in the critically ill child with shock: a prospective observational study

Version: 1 Date: 11 November 2007

Reviewer: George Briassoulis

Reviewer's report:

General

The study by Jesús López-Herce et al dealing with the “ENTERAL NUTRITION IN THE CRITICALLY ILL CHILD WITH SHOCK: PROSPECTIVE OBSERVATIONAL STUDY” suggests that transpyloric enteral nutrition is an effective method of nutrition for the critically ill child with shock, although the incidence of digestive tract complications is higher than in other critically ill patients. They do not add much new knowledge, since their conclusions are already known, although not restricted to the cardiogenic shock group of patients. Thus, in their previous publication, they concluded: The tolerance of TEN in critically ill children is good, although the incidence of gastrointestinal complications is higher in patients with shock, acute renal failure, hypokalemia, hypophosphatemia, and those receiving epinephrine, dopamine, and vecuronium. European Journal of Clinical Nutrition advance online publication, 28 February 2007; doi:10.1038/sj.ejcn.1602710.

Similar studies have also been published, although focused on different topic:


Major Compulsory Revisions

Regarding the manuscript itself, it says too little with a much extended discussion, repetition of findings in tables and results, reviewing rather than discussing findings, comparing non-adequately controlled groups with a lot of grammatical and spelling errors. Most patients with shock had cardiogenic shock. But what shock was the Respiratory insufficiency (12.3%), the other medical diagnoses (18.4%) or the other surgery (3%)? There are many other methodological errors.
Nonetheless, it might make a relatively important short paper, if it could be focus on cardiogenic shock compared to non-cardiogenic shock, presenting the findings in tables without repeating everything in the results sections and discussing in maximum one page the findings.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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