

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 82804

Title: Approaches to neuroprotection in pediatric neurocritical care

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05226306

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACS, MBBS, MCh, MNAMS

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-01 11:50

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-01 12:36

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 Grade E: Do not publish
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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
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. Are there differences in trauma / nontrauma linked clinical scenarios? 2. Does age differences (preterm / neonate / infant / toddler) impact implementation / strategies in neurocritical care? 3. What exactly are the knowledge gaps in practice and how to address the same? 4. Utilization of charts / tables / illustrations would elevate the readability of the review 5. Can a stepwise algorithm in the pediatric neurocritical care management be drawn to get an overview?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 82804

Title: Approaches to neuroprotection in pediatric neurocritical care

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04551037

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-16 11:39

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-25 07:12

Review time: 8 Days and 19 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
Novelty 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 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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 Title. "Approaches to Neuroprotection in Pediatric Neurocritical Care: A brief review" a minor change can be better 2 Abstract. Appropriate 3 Key Words. Appropriate 4 Background. Appropriate 5 Methods. N/A 6 Results. N/A 7 Discussion. An illustration for the mechanism section would be better. 8 Illustrations and tables. An illustration for the mechanism section would be better. 9 Biostatistics. N/A 10 Units. Appropriate 11 References. Appropriate 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Above average 13 Research methods and reporting. Appropriate 14 Ethics statements. N/A