

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77827

Title: Clinical Challenges of glycemic control in the Intensive Care Unit: A narrative

review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02885211 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: DO

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-06 23:43

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-10 10:49

Review time: 3 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Peer-reviewer statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written concise review, the authors need to reference wherever there is a mention of a study results. There are many throughout paper



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77827

Title: Clinical Challenges of glycemic control in the Intensive Care Unit: A narrative

review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02489089 **Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Austria

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-11 20:10

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-19 10:23

Review time: 7 Days and 14 Hours

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 [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, thanks a lot for having the opportunnity to review you manuscript. Here are my comments: The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript, the abstract summarize and reflects the work described in the manuscript. There are no keywords declared in the manuscript. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study. It is formed as a review of the current state of the art in clinical challenges of postsurgicalk diabetes admitted to the Intensive Care Unit. Experiments are not in the focus of the manuscript. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. But tere is no discussion of the topic and the conclusion is too short. The relevance to clinical practice is not really sufficiently, more aspects would give more benefit. Table 1 is too small for showing the landmark studies. Legend is ok. Obviously the manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. Self-cites could not be found. Overall the manuscript is good organized an presentet, but I recommend to edit the crossover from one part to the next part of the manuscript, because sometimes it looks like a brick in the manuscript. Style, language and grammar is accurate and appropriate. Overall the manuscripts is prepared as a Systematic review, but it would be a good way to bring the manuscript in a more conceptual way. Ethical approval is not necessary.