

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 17405

Title: From bronchiolitis guideline to practice: A critical care perspective

Reviewer's code: 02493079

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-05 16:24

Date reviewed: 2015-04-09 21:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is suitable published in the journal.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 17405

Title: From bronchiolitis guideline to practice: A critical care perspective

Reviewer's code: 00608249

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-05 16:24

Date reviewed: 2015-03-31 15:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is reasonably detailed. However, the text can be shorted significantly and replaced by summary tables and figures as follows. Summary tables summarizing the emergent methods with the appropriate literature and significant shortening of the text. Figures showing 1) Pathogenesis of disease. 2) Comparison of the methods and summary of key points/ future directions. The text can be better organized.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 17405

Title: From bronchiolitis guideline to practice: A critical care perspective

Reviewer's code: 02496740

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-05 16:24

Date reviewed: 2015-03-31 18:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good job, my suggest is to make a table in which could be summarize the features (identified as clinical indicators by the Authors in their studies) and what these features predict. No other remarks.