Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 47862

Title: Gastrointestinal Stress Ulcer Prophylaxis in the ICU: Where is the Data?

Reviewer's code: 00036517

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-02-12 07:30

Reviewer performed review: 2019-02-13 06:07

Review time: 22 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: [Y] Advanced [ ] General [ ] No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think authors need more informations for the new reviews about the protection from gastrointestinl bleeding at ICU.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 47862

Title: Gastrointestinal Stress Ulcer Prophylaxis in the ICU: Where is the Data?

Reviewer's code: 01800952

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-02-15 11:11

Reviewer performed review: 2019-02-17 05:17

Review time: 1 Day and 18 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript: [Y] Advanced [ ] General [ ] No expertise Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have written an editorial review about drug therapy in Stress Ulcer Prophylaxis in ICU setting. As is obvious no conclusions have been drawn from the literature cited. Trials have shown beneficial results as well as no beneficial results and there are issue of adverse drug reactions including complications (pneumonia and C.

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

difficile infection). Several issue need to be critically reviewed/commented while reviewing this important topics. All of them are missing. These include: I. Critical analysis of the drug trial mentioned/reviewed and how much we can depend upon its conclusions. It is not enough to mention about what trials found but to assess what is the quality of the trial. ii. All meta-analysis need a similar analysis as to the quality of trials reviewed based on several features mentioned in the meta-analysis. iii. Drug dose and route of administration has not been touched at all. iii. The last trial (NEJM2018) which authors mentioned in Abstract and then in the main text needs a critical comment. iv. If all available material is reviewed critically, I am of the opinion we can find why there is so much discrepancies between trials. v. Authors left it open as to what should be done for Stress Ulcer Prophylaxis and what guidelines shall a Intensivist follow for his next patient.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

BPG Search:

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No