

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

Manuscript NO: 61710

Title: Reduced exercise capacity and self-perceived health status in high-risk patients undergoing lung resection

Reviewer's code: 05378739

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc, PhD

Professional title: Postdoc, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Poland

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-09 09:38

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-13 11:34

Review time: 4 Days and 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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



**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

In their manuscript Rodríguez-Torres J. et al. al. focused on to identify the differences between high and low-risk patients in exercise capacity and self-perceived health status at discharge and in the following month. The work seems to accurately describe the selected topic. The title reflected the main hypothesis of the manuscript. Abstract summarized and reflected the work described in the manuscript, Key words reflected the focus of the manuscript. The manuscript adequately described the background, present status and significance of the study. In the "MATERIALS AND METHODS Study population and data collection" section, the name of the hospital from which patients were recruited and the number of the bioethics committee are missing, besides, the manuscript describes the methods properly. It was a longitudinal observational prospective cohort study The findings show a poorer recovery in high-risk patients, with more self-perceived fatigue, a lower self-perceived health status and a poorer upper and lower limbs exercise capacity. These results represent an advance in the field of rehabilitation since it allows the design of specific rehabilitation programs for each risk group. The manuscript interpreted the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their applicability to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion accurate and discussed the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. The figure 1 and tables are sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. The manuscript metted the requirements of biostatistics and the requirements of use of SI units. The manuscript cited appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. The style, language and grammar are accurated and appropriated. The

author prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. The author prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting and the manuscript met the requirements of ethics, but missed the number of ethics committee in section Methodology. Therefore, I propose to publish this manuscript for future use in clinical practice.