

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 84174

Title: Biomarkers in sepsis- Looking for the Holy Grail or chasing a mirage!

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04723746

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-03 11:23

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-07 13:10

Review time: 4 Days and 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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

1.The epidemiology of sepsis worldwide should be described, including incidence and mortality rates. 2.Diagnostic criteria related to sepsis are not stated. 3.The tables are not depicted in a standard way. 4.The conclusions do not mention the following: 1. risk factors for sepsis; 2 factors related to disease progression and prognosis; 3 treatment goals, etc.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 84174

Title: Biomarkers in sepsis- Looking for the Holy Grail or chasing a mirage!

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05170593

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-10 17:17

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-21 16:48

Review time: 10 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" 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

The paper submitted for the publication as review, deals with a topic of great interest from clinical as well as biochemical point-of-view: in fact the sepsis represent a very relevant challenge also today. However, the content of the paper seems to be totally inadequate and not updated to provide the most important informations about the biomarkers not only those actually used but also those in development. In the present form the review not provide any new and relevant updated informations. Furthermore, the paragraph aimed to describe the usefulness of new technologies, such as metabolomic, is largely incomplete lacking the description of other improved technologies genomic, proteomic, etc that are described in the literature as new diagnostic and prognostic tools in sepsis.