

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68240

Title: Correlation between circulating endothelial cell level and acute respiratory distress syndrome in postoperative patients

Reviewer's code: 06060818

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-04 23:10

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-06 01:37

Review time: 1 Day and 2 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you very much for asking me to review this manuscript by Min Peng et al. This is a retrospective study to explore the correlation between circulating endothelial cell level and severity of ARDS in patients postoperatively. The result of the study is of interest and may help evaluate the status and prognosis of ARDS and provide an objective reference for diagnosis and treatment. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English. It might be the first study to compare numbers of CECs in patients with ARDS. The number of participants in the study is large enough. Furthermore, minor comment that I would to proposed: 1. Title: Proper and cover all the core result from the study. 2. Abstract: Address all of the important component from the study. However, I recommend that the description in the methods be clearer and that the control group and other groups need to be clearly explained. 3. Key words: could cover this study. 4. Introduction: Describe the overall basic knowledge for this study. Moreover, the aim of the study is clear. 5. Method: The present study is methodologically well conducted. 6. Results: The result of this study is of interest. 7. Discussion: The manuscript clearly interprets the finding adequately and appropriately. In addition, the manuscript highlights the key points clearly. The previous significant paper involved were included in the discussion, I suggest to add the significance of the study, its current limitations, and what further research is required. 8. Tables and figures: I congratulate the authors for the captions to the tables and figures very explicative and complete. 9. References: The manuscript reviewed previous related literature; however, the format of references should be modified.