

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Critical Care Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 71082

Title: Critical care practices in the world: Results of the global intensive care unit need assessment survey 2020

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05352593

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Colombia

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-06 10:05

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-13 14:58

Review time: 7 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	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

Thanks for inviting me to read this study. This study assessed by survey the variation in practice in critical care settings across all health systems. They reported several important findings: • Most physicians have 31-40 years (29.8%), are males (65.3%), and have < 10 years of experience (50.4%). • Most ICUs are mixed medical-surgical (76%), have between 11-20 ICU beds (31.4%), and are Closed ICU (56.2%). • Most ICUs have patient: nurse ratio of 2:1 (33.9%), 24 hours in-house intensivist (58.7%) and certified intensivist (85.3%). • Some critical care protocols have a wrong adherence; such as palliative care/end of life (43.8%), delirium (66.9%), early mobility (68.6%), and hypothermia after cardiac arrest (61.2%). • The predominant diagnosis was sepsis (87.6%) and respiratory failure ((88%). This is an important study because its findings allow the health system to improve ICU resources and create strategies to optimize critical care. However, the authors should perform a stratified analysis by region, this describes the variation in practice in critical care that I believe is the main aim of their study. I have some minor comments: • Abstract: This section must be improved. The aim study is not clear. The methods must describe which variables will be evaluated. Also, includes that some critical care protocols have a wrong adherence. • Introduction: as described, the aim study is ambiguous, this must be clarified. • Methods: this section must be divided into three sections for a better understanding; such as study design, description of variables or outcomes, and statistical analyses. All evaluated variables must be described. • I cannot find the survey in supplementary material. Tables: • the abbreviations used must be described • please, included SD or IQR. Discussion: • this section is well written. The authors claimed that “Considering that



**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>

this was a multinational study, it is important to note that local practices and resources may vary between different regions. A lack of resources may limit the total number of beds available, or even result in a lower number of monthly admissions (9) in a given center relative to other regions. Because financial resources may influence how patients are triaged or how the healthcare organization is structured (10), it is important to keep this in mind when evaluating multi-center data from different countries” this statement is very important. The authors should perform stratified analyzes by each region (South America, Europe, Australia). These findings will improve their study since they describe the different practices among regions.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Critical Care Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 71082

Title: Critical care practices in the world: Results of the global intensive care unit need assessment survey 2020

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05318117

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD, RN

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Nurse, Professor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-19 00:29

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-19 03:17

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	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

September 18, 2021 Observational Study Critical Care Practices in the World: Results of the Global ICU Need Assessment Survey (GINA 2020) General comments: Thank you for the opportunity to review this timely article on an important topic. The authors carried out a a cross-sectional, multinational, survey-based study whose purpose was the formation of a multidisciplinary, diverse team of skilled researchers who established the “Global ICU Needs Assessment (GINA) Research Group.” The study is well-written as well as is relevant. Also, this study brings some interesting results and new insights as a potential contribution to the field. By understanding the nature of ICU practices on a global scale, administrative leaders can create long-term strategies for improved research and quality improvement measures. This study sets a novel benchmark in sharing insights on key areas of critical care by highlighting the state of ICUs across different countries and understanding the trends in contemporary health systems. By defining gaps in knowledge, resources, and protocols, this study can facilitate the development of best practice strategies and thereby lay a strong foundation for critical care provision worldwide. Therefore, I believe that this is a novel paper with a topic that will be great interest for WJCC readers.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Critical Care Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 71082

Title: Critical care practices in the world: Results of the global intensive care unit need assessment survey 2020

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05352593

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Colombia

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-03

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-29 10:54

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-29 23:36

Review time: 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for inviting me to read this study. I thank the authors that have considered my comments. They have satisfactorily addressed all my comments and questions, and the article has been significantly improved