

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 25388

Title: Determination of functional prognosis in hospitalized patients following an intensive care admission

Reviewer's code: 00214259

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-09 16:14

Date reviewed: 2016-03-28 03:33

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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

This is a well-written manuscript about functional rehabilitation and muscle strength following an ICU admission. Authors should give more details about the way they screened participants, how much patients they excluded and for which reasons. I understand that maybe patients who deceased during hospitalization were excluded. Compilations and comparisons of their data are important and should be provided. The major issues of this research ground on statistics descriptions. Amount of patients seem small related to the amount of factor that were analysed. Justifications should be done. Who did the analysis? It should be mentioned to guaranty the validity of conclusions. As age median is 80 years old, this study concerned elderly patients and this give some new data about that population. Is some more analysis can be made about that subgroup? Is longer total length of stay can be a predictor of good patients functional progress because some patients could have been discharged too soon?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 25388

Title: Determination of functional prognosis in hospitalized patients following an intensive care admission

Reviewer's code: 00502802

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-09 16:14

Date reviewed: 2016-04-16 01:46

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 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 checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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

The article is well written but I have certain reservations: 1. Introduction is very lengthy. It should be made more focused. 2. There are several grammatical and typographical error, which makes understanding difficult 3. Exclusion criteria should be defined properly 4. Pts on mechanical ventilators were excluded, the impact of such an intervention should be properly addressed in discussion. It could be one of the limitations of the study 5. Abbreviations, when used for first time, should be described eg. MRC score 6.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 25388

Title: Determination of functional prognosis in hospitalized patients following an intensive care admission

Reviewer's code: 00029041

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-03-09 16:14

Date reviewed: 2016-04-17 19:31

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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

This paper is well-written. Several points should be clarified. 1. Introduction should be shortened. 2. Were dead patients analysed?