

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84573

**Title:** Should we initiate vasopressors earlier in patients with septic shock: a mini systemic review

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02445547

**Position:** Associate Editor

**Academic degree:** DNB, FEBS, FICS, FRCS (Gen Surg), MBBS, MNAMS

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Director, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-05-06 13:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-05-06 14:07

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

Dear Authors I apologise to accept the review. I realised that this is more of a critical care kind of paper and not much surgical critical care. This is largely outside my scope and i am unable to "undo" the review selection. So i shall only make brief comment and recommend as "good" so that i am not unfair to you. I shall also separately mention the same to editor too and he can activate another reviewer.

1. I find >10 grammar errors and sentence formation errors.
2. I do not see any mention on source control within your protocol of early vasopressor.
3. I also do not see interplay with early steroid or choice of fluid like 5% albumin etc.
4. The problems of early vasopressors in underfilled patient with myocardial ischaemia?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84573

**Title:** Should we initiate vasopressors earlier in patients with septic shock: a mini systemic review

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05080957

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DNB, MBBS, MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-01 01:29

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-05 08:35

**Review time:** 4 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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



**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>

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

Greetings I read your manuscript with interest. The topic has clinical relevance. Systematic search strategy to formulate the evidence is a strength. Overall the manuscript is also well written. However, I would suggest a major revision to present the manuscript as per PRISMA guideline. Otherwise the study and content has no major limitations. Best of luck

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 84573

**Title:** Should we initiate vasopressors earlier in patients with septic shock: a mini systemic review

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03110530

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FACE, FCCP, MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Director, Staff Physician

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-03-20

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-01 11:42

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-06 15:01

**Review time:** 5 Days and 3 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

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

The topic of early vasopressor initiation in septic shock is clinically relevant and understudied. A systematic review would be valuable for researchers and clinicians. However it is essential that systematic reviewers follow a standardized approach describing of why the review was done, how studies were identified and selected and what they found (such as characteristics of contributing studies and results of meta-analyses). Such a standardized approach is absent in the present study. I would encourage the authors to follow the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines and checklist for their study.