PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you submitting your research work and opportunity to review it. I read with great interest the manuscript. I have some issue such as -regarding scoring method describe in Table 1. Emotional state can only get score of 1 OR 2, However, it appears that it can get more scoring but not sure on what basis.   - No. of events are small compare to no. of patients in the study. Thus, fragility index is quite high. 1 or 2 less event could decrease validity of HUERAS.   - Authors does not make attempt to describe the possible reason for differences between various extubation such as why possible explanation why it happens more during certain ward, time of the day etc. with references if available.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 79619

Title: Predictive value of the unplanned extubation risk assessment scale in hospitalized patients with tubes

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06367185

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Associate Research Scientist, Lecturer, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ethiopia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-14

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-28 04:44

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-28 04:48

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- introduction should be rewritten - methods should be more clarified

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors! At first I am very happy getting the chance to review your manuscript. Here is my evaluation: The title reflects the main subjecthesis of the manuscript. The abstract summarize and reflects the work described in the manuscript, the key words reflects the focus of your manuscript and it also adequately describes the background, present status and significance of your study. The manuscript describes methods in an appropriate way. Research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study. Contribution of your study is very important for patient safety for inpatients to prevent complications in correlation with an unplanned extubation. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. Findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. Discussion is accurate and discusses the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. The only point I have to note is that 26 unplanned extubations are not really high enough to support all the results of your study based on your ststistical analyses, but: It's a beginning in research of that important topic. You only have to make very clear in your manuscript that your analysis based on a vulnerable number of unplanned extubations (MINOR REVISION). Tables are sufficient, in good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Style, language and grammar is accurate and appropriate? Authors prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics. Best regards! Your reviewer