

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 60557

**Title:** Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for coronavirus disease 2019-associated acute respiratory distress syndrome: Report of two cases

**Reviewer's code:** 05382254

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Chief Physician, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-11-09 22:52

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-11-11 07:48

**Review time:** 1 Day and 8 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Jun-Lin Wen et al. reported that two COVID-19 patients were treated with (ECMO) in the course of diagnosis and treatment, and had different results, especially the pregnant woman, which is a special case and worthy of further study. Major revision: The case report does not simply list the treatment history of the case, but through the diagnosis and treatment analysis of the case, certain conclusions (or experience and lessons) can be drawn from it for clinical reference and even guide clinical practice. There is currently some encouraging evidence that the use of ECMO in COVID-19 is clinically beneficial. Both patients were treated with ECMO, but the results were different. Why did this result occur? The author lacks an analysis of the reasons and draws appropriate conclusions from it. Minor revision: The running title has a too broad meaning and it is recommended to modify it. It is suggested to supplement the final COVID-19 virus nucleic acid reexamination results of these two patients. If so, it is recommended to provide the results of the lungs' CT images of the patients before discharge. It is recommended to add references to line 99. Line 118-122, the Chief complaints should be concise, and part of the content can be transferred to the History of present illness. Line 125, When did she get back from Wuhan? Line 144-150, it is suggested to improve the important contents of physical examination, especially the auscultation of both lungs. Line 261-264, because the patient has a history of hypertension and coronary heart disease, it is recommended to supplement the patient's blood pressure and cardiac auscultation. Line 412-415, it is recommended to add references. Line 420-423, it is recommended to add references. It is recommended that the references list all the authors.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 60557

**Title:** Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for coronavirus disease 2019-associated acute respiratory distress syndrome: Report of two cases

**Reviewer's code:** 00243376

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Hungary

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** Le Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-11-14 11:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-11-14 16:44

**Review time:** 4 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this paper Authors investigated the potential use of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation(ECMO) in two patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)-associated acute respiratory distress syndrome. I've personally found this paper valuable, however there are many issues, which should be addressed before publication: In case 1: - How would the Authors rule out, if there was no HELLP-syndrome by the pregnant women? Liver enzymes were elevated, Low Platelet number was reported and Disseminant Intravascular Coagulation(DIC) was also present by this case? Covid 19 could be only co-finding, which was then later exacerbated? In case 2: What is the Authors opinion, VV-ECMO did have an effect on the right herart failure(RHF)? What were the ECHO parameters of right ventricle? TAPSE? The ventilation pressure (Pinsp) and PEEP were too high during VV-ECMO support. In literature state, that ultra-protective ventilation might have an important role to minimizes the ventilator-induced lung injury. The benefits should be discussed! A structured review of the literature and a table about it would be outstanding and important! In general there are too many typos througout the text.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 60557

**Title:** Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for coronavirus disease 2019-associated acute respiratory distress syndrome: Report of two cases

**Reviewer's code:** 05382254

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Chief Physician, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ru Fan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-12-26 22:55

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-12-27 13:59

**Review time:** 15 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author analyzed the reasons why the two patients were treated with ECMO but the results were different. It can be seen that the author revised it very carefully and consulted a lot of data. The results of the answers are satisfactory. In other minor repair parts, the author revised History of present illness according to the requirements, supplemented some appropriate references, listed all the authors of the references, and met the requirements of the review.