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Reviewer's report:

General

The authors describe the first case of a patient in whom stress-echo was used to assess suitability for heart donation. This is a very interesting and novel approach to the problem of marginal heart donors, that, after additional studies, may have impact on routine clinical practice.

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

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

1. General. Although reviewer is not a native English speaker it appears that language and style in the manuscript are somewhat confusing and should be thoroughly revised.

2. General. The paper should be considerably shortened, especially in The case report section.

3. Case report. What inotropic agents were used, and in which doses? If dobutamine was used wouldn’t it be simpler to proceed to high-dose dobutamine? If not, please comment on possible impact of inotropic stressor on sensitivity and specificity of dipyridamole stress-echocardiography.

4. Discussion. Authors should discuss in more detail potential advantages and disadvantages of TEE dipyridamole stress-echocardiography in this setting.

5. Discussion. In the cited papers FFR was assessed by transthoracic, not by transesophageal echocardiography. Please comment on possible effects of TEE on accuracy of serial ESVi measurements of ESVi.

6. Discussion. The presence of wall motion abnormalities should by no means lead to automatical exclusion of donor hearts in the absence of history of coronary artery disease, since it has been shown that low-dose dobutamine can identify reversible myocardial dysfunction in brain-dead patients (Kono T et al. Am J Cardiol. 1999 Sep 1;84(5):578-82.) Please comment.

7. Conclusions. Conclusions should be shortened to not more than two or three sentences, the rest should be placed in the Discussion.

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

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


2. Page 6. Paragraphs 2 and 3. Should be rewritten or omitted since it appears that they were paste
from the protocol for the other study.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

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

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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