PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73913

Title: Perioperative respiratory muscle training improves respiratory muscle strength and physical activity of patients receiving lung surgery: a meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03821836

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Fellow, Research Scientist, Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-09 08:15

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-17 10:33

Review time: 8 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Authors should add to the limitations section the fact that they included only articles published in English.   2. Please provide grading of evidence (GRADE).   3. Did the authors assess any "hard" outcomes, such as in-hospital death or post-operative respiratory tract infections? Were such outcomes reported across the selected trials. Please elucidate.   4. Overall, the manuscript is interesting, well-designed and well-written.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73913

Title: Perioperative respiratory muscle training improves respiratory muscle strength and physical activity of patients receiving lung surgery: a meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05114928

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Physiotherapist, Postdoc

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Czech Republic

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-18 19:32

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-20 09:57

Review time: 1 Day and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript was prepared very well, congratulations to authors. The introduction section justifies the purpose of the study. Also, the study design and methods used, are appropriate. However, there are some points, that needs to be adresseded. Introduction • Why have you focused on perioperative RMT Interventions? What makes them different from pre-habilitation interventions? clarify this issue • What are the potential benefits of perioperative RMT in patients receiving lung surgery?   • Can it be applied to different types of lung surgery? • Are there any contraindications? What are they? Materials and Methods • Inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria: any exclusion criteria? If not, consider to revise the subchapter title Results • Consider including information on the origin of the studies   Discussion • Although there is an excellent description of the studies and description of the results, possible mechanisms related to the results described in the manuscript could be added. In addition, a brief comparative discussion of the differences between studies could be added • What is new about perioperative RMT in patients after lung surgery in this manuscript? • Could a general perioperative RMT protocol be established to achieve the positive results it shows? • What impacts did covid-19 have on this area? Consider adding a short discussion on this topic, • In addition, is it possible to use the telehealth or digital health (mHealth) approach in perioperative interventions in patients after lung surgery? adding a future perspective on this content (if any) could be very interesting for reades

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The quality of the manuscript was improved. Congratulations

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 73913

Title: Perioperative respiratory muscle training improves respiratory muscle strength and physical activity of patients receiving lung surgery: a meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03821836

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Fellow, Research Scientist, Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-08

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-19 12:36

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-21 20:19

Review time: 2 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to thank the authors for answering to all addressed comments.