

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 24735

Title: Ethical publishing in intensive care medicine: A narrative review

Reviewer's code: 00227470

Reviewer's country: Netherlands

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-14 12:17

Date reviewed: 2016-04-21 03:52

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 checked="" 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 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

Thank you very much for writing this manuscript. The topic of scientific misconduct makes this a sad review, but the author discusses two recent examples well and explains clearly what can be done to potentially detect and fight unethical ways of doing and publishing research. I do not have specific comments.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 24735

Title: Ethical publishing in intensive care medicine: A narrative review

Reviewer's code: 03220843

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-14 12:17

Date reviewed: 2016-05-09 14:46

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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

I am glad having the opportunity of reviewing the manuscript 24735, 'Ethical Publishing in Intensive Care Medicine: A Narrative Review'. The paper is very interesting. However, I believe that minor alterations and improvements are needed before the paper is suitable for publication. Of 48 retracted publications, almost half of them (22) were Fujii's and Boldt's papers. I believe it would be nice either to shorten the text about Fujii and Boldt as examples or either extend the examples to other writers with also retracted publications. Your references should be corrected (No. 5 and 17 are the same) and minor language polishing is needed.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 24735

Title: Ethical publishing in intensive care medicine: A narrative review

Reviewer's code: 00502864

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-14 12:17

Date reviewed: 2016-02-27 21:35

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good, interesting and well-written narrative review of the problems of ethical publication issues, with especial reference to two recent case series. There were a few very minor errors - eg, in methodology, the author refers to 'authors', although I think there's only one? The opening sentence of p8 para 2 needs revising. The middle sentence in para 1, p9 similarly. The only statement I would question is in the first bullet point of the conclusion: it's now 2016, and hand-written signatures are not necessary. Many journals gave up that requirement years ago, and we should really now be using electronic forms of signature. Lastly, figure 1 appears as a black square on the download. I guess this is a software glitch, but I have no idea what the image is meant to be, and can't therefore comment as to whether this really is 'exponential' (as claimed in the text).

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 24735

Title: Ethical publishing in intensive care medicine: A narrative review

Reviewer's code: 00502853

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-14 12:17

Date reviewed: 2016-04-25 16:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input 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 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"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author deals with a controversial topic in an illustrative and detailed form. The manuscript is of interest for the readers and deserves to be published. Very minor comments: Some grammar corrections are necessary, especially in the abstract (ie, the first paragraph is very difficult to follow). Reference 5 and 17 are the same one. It has to be corrected along with numbering of the rest of references.