

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86227

Title: Analysis of prognostic factors in patients with emergency sepsis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06143860

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-07 06:51

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-18 08:17

Review time: 11 Days and 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 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

This study aimed to analyse the factors influencing the prognosis of patients with emergency sepsis in order to provide a basis for individualised patient treatment and care. The authors conducted a comprehensive analysis of factors such as age, gender, underlying disease, etiology and site of infection, inflammatory indicators, multi-organ failure, cardiovascular function, therapeutic measures, immune status and severity of infection. The aim of the study is clear, and the methods are described in detail. The results are interesting and well discussed. Minor comments: 1. The manuscript requires a minor editing. Some minor language polishing should be revised. 2. The references should be reduced. Please only keep the most important references.

Reply :

1. "The manuscript requires a minor editing. Some minor language polishing should be revised."

Reply: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We will carefully review and revise the manuscript to ensure accuracy, fluency, and clarity of language expression.

We will pay attention to correcting any grammar, spelling, or word choice issues to enhance the overall quality of the document.

2. "The references should be reduced. Please only keep the most important references."

Reply: I completely agree with your point. We will reevaluate the references and select them based on their direct relevance and importance to the study. Keeping only the most crucial references that contribute to supporting the research findings can improve the conciseness and accuracy of the manuscript.

Thank you for providing valuable feedback. We will thoroughly consider your suggestions during the revision process.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 86227

Title: Analysis of prognostic factors in patients with emergency sepsis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06110696

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-06 02:52

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-18 10:20

Review time: 12 Days and 7 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 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 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 is an interesting study of the analysis of prognostic factors in patients with emergency sepsis. The findings of this brief study are interesting. The reviewer recommends to accept this manuscript after a minor editing.

Reply :Thank you very much for your interest and positive feedback on our study regarding the analysis of prognostic factors in patients with emergency sepsis. We are delighted to hear that you recognize the value and novelty of our research. We will carefully consider your editing suggestions and make the necessary revisions accordingly. During the revision process, we will focus on enhancing the accuracy, fluency, and clarity of language expression to further improve the quality of the manuscript.

Once again, we sincerely appreciate your review and recommendations. We will strive to meet your requirements and make the revised manuscript even more outstanding and reader-friendly.