

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 38306

**Title:** Confidence level of Pediatric Trainees for Management of Shock States

**Reviewer's code:** 00506409

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Li-Jun Cui

**Date sent for review:** 2018-02-13

**Date reviewed:** 2018-02-16

**Review time:** 3 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript presents an interesting study on the approach from health care workers dealing with children in conditions of shock. In a web-based survey in the US, 4 hypothetical clinical conditions were presented, and the respondents asked to make a selection out of a number of treatment options. Also the confidence level in making decisions was analyzed. Out of 539 respondents, 490 participants, residents and fellows, entered the study, excluding medical students and attending physicians. Significant differences were observed between experts (fellows in pediatric critical care, pediatric emergency medicine and pediatric hospital medicine, n=52) and non-experts (n=438) in selecting treatment options, and also a significant difference in confidence levels was observed. The authors conclude that in general residents and fellows described as non-experts have a low level of confidence in making proper decisions when confronted with children in shock conditions, warranting proper education programs in these

clinical conditions. The authors correctly describe the limitations of this study and study conclusions, i.e., a one-time picture of a patient presented on paper instead of a development in time in a real patient in the hospital. This is an interesting study, which is well described regarding design, results, and which is properly discussed. There are just a few suggestions in revision: • There should be a list of abbreviations • The treatment options for individual cases should be clearly described as being part of the questionnaire, i.e., respondents could not present their opinion but had to select one of the given treatment options. • The structure of results and discussion can be improved, with separate paragraphs for each scenario.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 38306

**Title:** Confidence level of Pediatric Trainees for Management of Shock States

**Reviewer's code:** 03345330

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Li-Jun Cui

**Date sent for review:** 2018-02-13

**Date reviewed:** 2018-02-23

**Review time:** 9 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulation for this interesting study, several comments: 1. please added the reference of "ACCM guidelines" 2. This CVP could not predict the fluid response, but the value of CVP such as, reflect the cardiac function and fluid tolerance et should be emphasized in this paper 3. The extremely value of CVP remain to be useful to reflect the volume status