

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 67661

Title: Endotracheal Intubation Sedation in the Intensive Care Unit

Reviewer's code: 04213276

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-30 09:25

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-30 17:38

Review time: 8 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A nice mini-review, discussing the regimens that are available for sedation in the setting of endotracheal intubation. The review expertly highlights facts regarding well-known drugs and effectively inserts the new combination of propofol - ketamine in the discussion of the most effective and safe sedation regimens in this specific setting.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 67661

Title: Endotracheal Intubation Sedation in the Intensive Care Unit

Reviewer's code: 05322873

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-01 09:10

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-01 10:17

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ Y] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Dr I did not see any innovation in the manuscript