

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24941

**Title:** Enteral nutrition administration in a surgical intensive care unit: Achieving goals with better strategies

**Reviewer's code:** 00502932

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-27 13:15

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-09 08:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Primary significant finding is reduction in time to achieve goal tube feed rate. Perhaps more expansion of discussion section to define where and how the protocol can be optimized, in order to achieve significant improvement in the other important parameters, would be appropriate.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 24941

**Title:** Enteral nutrition administration in a surgical intensive care unit: Achieving goals with better strategies

**Reviewer's code:** 02822922

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-02-27 13:15

**Date reviewed:** 2016-03-17 17:23

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 checked="" 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"/> No	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting well-written paper, focused on a topic, where data from literature are lacking. However, some minor revisions are needed. In details, I'd suggest the authors better explain their EN feeding protocol as the provision of Figure 1 may not be sufficient for the Readers. They should provide specific and clear-cut data on their protocol within the text. Additionally, the retrospective nature of present study does not allow to draw solid conclusions. Authors should better discuss this point.