

Responses to reviewers

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Authors describe two cases of severe respiratory failure due to Covid-19 infection successfully treated by Sequential Weaning Protocol. Main problems with this paper are:

a. A linguistic review is necessary

Reply: The manuscript has received professional English language editing services from the American company, **Write Science Right**TM. The certificate is attached.

b. Every abbreviation needs to be preceded by the full text at the first mention

Reply: All abbreviations are now defined.

c. Core tip is not well focused to the main aspect of this report, i. e. the weaning protocol, and not limited to 100 words, as requested just to be clear and brief.

Reply: The core tip text (now 67 words) has been rewritten to improve focus and concision.

d. Many parts of the paper contain obvious and known concepts not finalized to the main message of this report, i. e. the weaning protocol advantage

Reply: The paper has been revised throughout to spend less time on known concepts and to be more focused on our protocol.

e. No literature data supporting the advantage of the procedure are clearly mentioned in the text in order to give a convincing quarrel in favor of the weaning protocol and its indications

Reply: We have added support from the literature related to our procedures (see 2nd paragraph, p.15, 1st paragraph, p.16 and Reference 9).

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The article "Two Mechanical Ventilated Cases of COVID-19 Successfully Managed with Sequential Weaning Protocol: A Case Report" addresses a current topic. However, its reading shows a certain repetition of placements, requiring a review of its outline. The discussion is long, totaling three pages for a case report of cases.

Reply: The paper has been revised to remove redundancies, and the Discussion has been reduced.

It is also necessary to review the references, as some of them are outside international standards.

Reply: Two references which are outside international standards were removed, together with the associated contents in the report.

It would be interesting to also review some minor points, such as: 60% oxygen absorption concentration, perhaps it is better to use: inspired fraction of oxygen;

Reply: Indeed, we intended to refer to inspired fraction of oxygen, and have made sure to use the term throughout the paper.

There was a clinical assessment of oxygenation in 1 hour in these patients and there was a failure of noninvasive ventilation?;

Reply: When the patients were on NIV, there were clinical assessments of their respiratory condition (added text) and oxygenation within 2 hours. Continued respiratory distress and low P/F ratio were

considered signs that NIV was insufficient and IMV was needed. We have added these clarifications (see 2nd paragraph, p.11).

At the end of the first paragraph of the introduction, replace to cure for to support the life; clarify when the patient's pronation was used?;

Reply: We have removed the word “cure” from this paragraph and instead describe the support provided (see 1st paragraph, p.6). We have added the clarification that pronation was used in the first 5 days of MV, 12 h/d from 9 pm to 9 am to both the case presentation and discussion sections (see 2nd paragraph, p.11 and last paragraph, p. 16, respectively).

In figures 1 and 2, despite the description of Chest CT, it would be interesting to introduce the imaging findings; Figure 3 of the Weaning protocol is unnecessary, as it is outlined in the text.

Reply: The imaging findings are now briefly described in the text and legends. Figure 3 has been deleted.