

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29679

**Title:** Timing, method, and discontinuation of hydrocortisone administration for septic shock patients

**Reviewer's code:** 02639698

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-25 21:37

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-14 03:46

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 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

it is a well design study, though performed in a small group of patients. . A paragraph on study limitations should be added to the discussion section.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29679

**Title:** Timing, method, and discontinuation of hydrocortisone administration for septic shock patients

**Reviewer's code:** 03343282

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-25 21:37

**Date reviewed:** 2016-10-21 05:08

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 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

A flow chart of the study should be added There is an overpresentation of pneumonia.Was VAP or Health Care Associated Pneumonia?A comment about a possible bias should be added in discussion. In norepinephrine dosage patient's weight was real or ideal?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29679

**Title:** Timing, method, and discontinuation of hydrocortisone administration for septic shock patients

**Reviewer's code:** 00502854

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-08-25 21:37

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-04 23:01

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

I think it's a good paper, but it has a major weakness: because it is a non-randomized study carried out in two hospitals, it's essential that the data are analyzed according to the hospital where patients have been recruited. All the results could be explained by this variable. Hospital must be analyzed. May be you could add the data in Table 1 and add the variable in the multivariate analysis.