

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

Manuscript NO: 69303

Title: Timing of Tracheostomy in Mechanically Ventilated COVID-19 Patients

Reviewer's code: 01221925

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: AGAF, FACS, FICS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-28 18:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-28 19:06

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

This is an interesting and timely paper evaluating the issue of timing of tracheostomy in mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients. Could the authors please respond to the following questions/comments: 1) The authors report all the different types of studies that they have identified and describe the findings. However, all these studies reported do not have the same value given the different methods used. The authors should either decide on a more systematic review of the available (limited) literature or add in the discussion a significant part regarding the limitations of the study which has to do with the limitations of the studies reported. 2) In the discussion, the authors mention the benefit for healthcare providers if one is to wait after the transmission period. However, as important as this argument could be for healthcare providers, it is not what should determine patient-oriented decisions. 3) In the discussion, the authors mention in a sentence what the majority of studies (of varying quality) mention. They should elaborate on this, discussing in more detail the rationale, the questions and lessons learnt from other similar situations.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

Manuscript NO: 69303

Title: Timing of Tracheostomy in Mechanically Ventilated COVID-19 Patients

Reviewer's code: 05393454

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-28 15:18

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-03 10:24

Review time: 4 Days and 19 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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 English need improvement since there are few grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript (For example, the words “that were” may be as “were”; “a severe” as “severe”; “nasal” as “a nasal”; “a variability” as “variability”; “timing” as “the timing”; “impact” as “their impact”; “tracheostomy” as “a tracheostomy”; “Authors” as “The authors”; “A study” as “In a study”; “in the” as “to the”; “mean time” as “the mean time”; “last” as “the last”; “onset” as “the onset”; “proceeding with tracheostomy” as “proceed with a tracheostomy”; in the table “if patient” as “if the patient”; “laryngeal” as “a laryngeal”; “emergent” as “the emergent”; “is prognosis” as “if the prognosis”; “decrease risk” as “decrease the risk”; “Mortality” as “The mortality”). The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here also to be checked and corrected properly. 2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text (For example, the words “ventilator associated” may be as “ventilator-associated”; “pattern” as “patterns”; “theaters” as “theatres”; “disease,” as “disease”; “60 day” as “60 days”; “study most” as “study, most”; “respirator” as “respiratory”; “follow-up” as “follow-ups”; “outweigh” as “outweighs”; “mean time” as “meantime”; “aerosol generating” as “aerosol-generating”; “in general” as “, in general,”; in the table “post procedure” as “post-procedure”; “avoids” as “avoid”; “Case specific” as “Case-specific”). The typos not mentioned here also to be checked and corrected properly. 3. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, ICU, Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery - AAO-HNS, etc.). And it should be in both abstract as well as in the remaining part of the manuscript. 4. In the introduction, the authors may include the recent data related with diagnosed case and mortality up to June, since it has been given only up to April. 5. The authors are encouraged to mention the percentage uniformly along with the



**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>

numbers of individuals or patients since in few parts it has been mentioned. And also the number of cases may be mentioned uniformly either in figure or words. 6. The table and figure legends should be improved and a proper footnote should be given. All legends should have enough description for a reader to understand the table and figure without having to refer back to the main text of the manuscript. 7. The limitation of the present review may be given separately before the conclusion derived. 8. The references are not arranged properly in a uniform format and they should be carefully checked and corrected as per the journal instructions. For example, in the table, the authors are mentioned the author name with initial and it should be removed. And also the back references are not attached with the manuscript and it should be included properly.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

Manuscript NO: 69303

Title: Timing of Tracheostomy in Mechanically Ventilated COVID-19 Patients

Reviewer's code: 05401630

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-04 10:02

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-06 12:10

Review time: 2 Days and 2 Hours

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
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

This review aims to examine the timing of tracheostomy procedures performed in COVID-19 patients by summarizing the relevant data. While the available data was limited, they found the majority of data support delaying the tracheostomy for the first two weeks of intubation. The paper is well organized and it's well written, I agree to publish in this journal.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

Manuscript NO: 69303

Title: Timing of Tracheostomy in Mechanically Ventilated COVID-19 Patients

Reviewer's code: 01221925

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: AGAF, FACS, FICS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-28

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-06 16:06

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-06 16:08

Review time: 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
Language quality	<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
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
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

I would like to thank the authors for their responses and the changes made accordingly