PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 81345

Title: Role of Cerebrospinal Fluid Lactate in Diagnosing Meningitis in Critically Ill Patients

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05388758

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor

Professional title: Associate Chief Physician, Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-14 07:18

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-14 08:49

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? [J11] Yes [J10] No Does this manuscript have important novelty? [J21] Yes [J20] No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation?

	[J31] Yes [J30] No
	Does this manuscript use reliable research methods?
	[J41] Yes [J40] No
	Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic?
	[J51] Yes [J50] No
	Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions?
	[J61] Yes [J60] No
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing
	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)
	[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper studied the role of cerebrospinal fluid lactic acid in the diagnosis of bacterial meningitis, but this is not enough. It is better to refine the level of lactic acid in meningitis caused by various pathogenic bacteria, so as to provide more precise drug selection for clinical anti-infective therapy: Gram-positive, Gram-negative bacteria, tuberculosis, fungi, etc. The value of metagenomic next-generation sequencing(NGS) in the diagnosis of intracranial infection can also be studied.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 81345

Title: Role of Cerebrospinal Fluid Lactate in Diagnosing Meningitis in Critically Ill Patients

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05584775

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-14 21:39

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-21 18:22

Review time: 6 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? [J11] Yes [J10] No Does this manuscript have important novelty? [J21] Yes [J20] No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation?

	[J31] Yes [J30] No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods? [J41] Yes [J40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? [J51] Yes [J50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? [J61] Yes [J60] No
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read the submitted manuscript with a lot of interest. I would like to congratulate authors for this well conducted study. I have few questions as below: What is the utility if this test for diagnosing meningitis with current evidence? Is there an advantage over traditional tests done currently. The authors are trying yo convey the message that it is useful even in patients with previously received antibiotics. But in their results, it appears that, for the same groups of patients, it's sensitivity, NPV, accuracy are significantly lower than traditional tests like TLC etc. So why do we need this test?   I would think that this can be an adjunctive to other tests, but with current evidence there is no meaningful use for it in a clinical set up. It would be helpful for the readers if this message is clear in the discussion section.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [　] Yes　[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No changes made