To,
The Editor,
World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

Re: **What We Learned in the Past Year in Managing our COVID-19 Patients in ICU?**

Dear Sir/Madam:
Attached, please find the revised manuscript based on the reviewers' comments. We hope that your readership will learn and will benefit from it. We like to thank the reviewers and the editorial staff for their trust in us as well as their patience. Please let us know with any questions

Regards

Salim Surani, MD

Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (High priority)
Specific Comments to Authors: The review is current, it is well prepared.

Response: We like to thank the reviewer for the excellent comments

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (High priority)
Specific Comments to Authors: This text is very enlightening and the author was able to describe our journey through the pandemic, starting from chaos towards evidence-based therapeutic measures. Such

evidence was unknown at first. Along the way we had mistakes and successes and, more importantly, we had hope all the time, although with long moments of despair. Such despair tempered with unpreparedness in some communities contributed to a greater panic in the community and also to the disregard for preventive measures. I think this editorial will help us to be more clear and calm in our conduct, remembering that measures already proven to be effective should always be valued.

Response: We like to thank the reviewer for the positive feedback of our manuscript.

(1) ***Science editor:*** 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes an editorial of the what we learned in the past year in managing our covid-19 patients in ICU. The topic is within the scope of the WJCCM. (1) Classification: Two Grades A and Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This text is very enlightening and the author was able to describe our journey through the pandemic, starting from chaos towards evidence-based therapeutic measures. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are no tables and no figures; (4) References: A total of 118 references are cited, including 96 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is 1 self-cited reference. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Two Grades A and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCCM. 5 **Issues raised: (1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; and (2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.**

Response: We thank the science editor for their comments. The authors contributions have been added as suggested. We also have added the PMID and DOI as well as have revised the references as suggested.

(2) ***Editorial office director:***

(3) ***Company editor-in-chief:*** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Critical Care Medicine, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the

manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Response: We have made the changes as suggested

****

Since the Covid is ever changing field, since the submission of the manuscript, couple of new studies have been published. We have added those and have made those changes in bold and relavent references have been added.