

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 87604

Title: Improvement of the nutritional support management system for patients in intensive care units

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746706

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Norway

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-27 09:15

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-07 09:08

Review time: 10 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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

Zhang YY et al. introduced an improved nutrition support management system for ICU patients based on closed-loop information management and psychological counseling. After the operation of the whole process management system, the scores of ICU medical staff's knowledge, attitudes/beliefs, and practices regarding nutritional support were comprehensively improved. It can improve the prognosis of ICU patients. I am confused about psychological nursing practices on page 3. Authors said, there were 3 questions on psychological nursing practices in total, and a 3-point Likert scale was used, with scores of 0, 1, 2, and 3 indicating none, seldom, sometimes, frequent, and persistent, respectively; the total score ranged from 0 to 12 points, and higher scores suggested more active psychological nursing practices. However, for the 3-point scale, the maximum total score should be 9 points. In addition, none, seldom, sometimes, frequent, and persistent, there are five options in total, which does not correspond to 0-3 and four scores. Overall, the manuscript is well written, but further editing and proofreading are needed to maintain the best sense of reading.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 87604

Title: Improvement of the nutritional support management system for patients in intensive care units

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746899

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Canada

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-26 00:44

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-07 10:02

Review time: 12 Days and 9 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 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

The whole manuscript is well drafted; however, some concerns have been noted including: 1. Write the objective/aim of the research clearly in the last paragraph of the introduction section. 2. The proportions of hospital bed-days of patients receiving different nutritional support methods, such as total PN, PN + EN, and total EN, were calculated, However, no total PN data were mentioned in the results of this study. 3. The data in Table 4 are quite different from the other tables, please check. 4. Page 12, the total length of ICU stay of patients in the improvement group and control group The results are different from those in Table 7. 5. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed wholly.