

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 82583

Title: Causative bacteria of ventilator-associated pneumonia in intensive care unit in bahrain: Prevalence and antibiotics susceptibility pattern

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, Nurse, Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Austria

Author's Country/Territory: Bahrain

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-13 12:42

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-17 08:44

Review time: 3 Days and 20 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors! I am very happy getting the chance to review your manuscript. Here is my evaluation: The title reflects the main subjectthesis 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 care and cure to prevent further complications during mechanical ventilation. 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. Tables are sufficient, in good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. The manuscript meets the requirements of statistical analysis. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. It 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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

Manuscript NO: 82583

Title: Causative bacteria of ventilator-associated pneumonia in intensive care unit in bahrain: Prevalence and antibiotics susceptibility pattern

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05080957

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DNB, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Bahrain

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-23

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-20 05:44

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-23 07:03

Review time: 3 Days and 1 Hour

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Greetings I read the manuscript with interest. Although the topic is well known, it still have clinical value. Overall the study is well conducted, written and described. The limitations of the study is also well mentioned. In my opinion the study do not have a major flaws or limitation, no ethical concerns and has scientific credibility. However, a few minor aspect need attention 1. You mention adult (>14 years). the age >14 years are not regarded as adults. Please rewrite. 2. You mention average ICU days before getting VAP and then presented the data as mean +/- SD. please correct. 3. The study type-prospective case control is better termed as cross-sectional study. 4. What types of culture were done- aerobic / anaerobic or both? 5. was fungal staining or cultures were also done? Best of luck