

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31406

**Title:** Generalizable items and modular structure for computerised physician staffing calculation on intensive care units

**Reviewer's code:** 00502903

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xiu-Xia Song

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-18 14:57

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-18 12:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript presents a remarkably comprehensive, mathematical model for ICU physician staffing that has been in use since its initial introduction in Germany 8 years ago. As the authors point out, outcomes related to use of this model have not been studied. Such data would be vital to understanding the relevance of this model. As such, the Conclusion should avoid any suggestion that the model may have been shown to improve patient safety and quality of management. To the contrary, the conclusion would be expected to propose evaluating these outcomes in the future. Despite the lack of data on outcomes, the staffing calculation is still of some interest.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31406

**Title:** Generalizable items and modular structure for computerised physician staffing calculation on intensive care units

**Reviewer's code:** 00506481

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Xiu-Xia Song

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-18 14:57

**Date reviewed:** 2016-11-29 13:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Table 4 Line 2 Cases A very useful review highlighting the importance of appropriate staffing to achieve best patient care.