

February 11, 2022
Montréal

OBJECT: Response to Editor
74974 (revised version)

Dear Editor,

On behalf of my co-authors and myself, I am submitting the enclosed revised manuscript entitled *“Diuretic Combinations in Critically ill Patients with Respiratory Failure; a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis”* for further consideration for publication in the World Journal of Critical Care Medicine.

We have also made revisions in response to the Editor and each of the reviewers, as detailed point-by-point below. We have also submitted a manuscript with highlighted changes.

We hope that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in the World Journal of Critical Care Medicine.

This manuscript has not been submitted to another journal, as we feel this original article will be of great interest to the readership of your journal.

Thank you for your ongoing consideration for this manuscript.

Your sincerely,



Jean Maxime Côté, MD, MSc, FRCPC
Consultant Nephrologist,
Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Montréal (CHUM)
Canada

Editor Comments:

Science editor:

Q: This manuscript is a meta-analysis of the efficacy and safety of common diuretic combinations in critically ill patients with respiratory failure. Please provide a section on the controversy over the use of a second diuretic in AHRF in the Introduction section, divide the "Eligibility Criteria" section into inclusion and exclusion criteria, write these two criteria under separate subheadings; supplement to the "Literature Search" section Key words for the search; referring to the meaning of the current study in the discussion.

R: *First of all, we would like to thank you for this review. We added a section in the introduction as requested. It really improved the explanation of why this study had to be performed. Thank you.*

As reported in the Table S2 from the Supplementary Material, 63 different Key Words were used in the final literature search. We did not consider that listing them in the main manuscript will improve the content of the manuscript.

Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Critical Care Medicine, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

R: All modifications and figure documents were integrated to the revised submission. Thank you.

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. What statistics tests were used? Please mention in the method section of abstract

R: Thank you for having reviewed our work. The statistical method was added in the method section.

2. The conclusion statement of abstract is not satisfactory, please revise it

R: As no suggestion was detailed, we slightly modified the conclusion to report that only the thiazide-loop diuretic combination was associated with an increased urine output, and we changed the wording of the last sentence.

3. In keywords the “Review, Systematic;” you can write it as “Systematic review”

R: Thank you. Changes were made accordingly.

4. Please divide the section “Eligibility Criteria” into Inclusion and exclusion criteria, write both of the criteria under separate subheading

R: Thank you for this suggestion. Changes were made accordingly.

5. In the “Literature Search” section please mention all the pertinent keywords used for searching of articles

R: As mentioned to the Editor, 63 MeSH were used for the definitive literature search. We did not consider helpful to list all of them. However, we added the categories of MeSH that were used in order to help the reader to better understand the literature search.

6. Which softwares were used for the statistical analysis please mention in the manuscript.

R: We forgot to include this essential information. Thank you very much for noticing that.

7. Please mention the implication of current study in the discussion section

R: Thank you for this suggestion. We added a new section in the discussion (just before the limitations). We considered it confirms the scientific relevance of the study. Thank you for this work.

8. The overall significant outcomes are quite little due to the unavailability of efficient data.

R: We agree with you. No hard outcomes such as ventilator-free survival has been reported in these studies. However, we still consider that the main objective of this systematic review has been answered.

Reviewer #2:

Specific Comments to Authors:

Overall, the article is rigorous and meaningful. I only have several comments.

1. The title “Diuretic Combinations in Critically ill Patients with Respiratory Failure; a Systematic Review with Meta-analysis” should be “Diuretic Combinations in Critically ill Patients with Respiratory Failure: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis”

R: Thank you. Modification was made accordingly.

2. The keywords should be listed in a proper order. For example: respiratory failure and diuretics should be listed ahead.

R: Thank you. We modified the order as suggested.

3. In the introduction section, the author should supply with a part on the controversy surrounding the use of a second diuretic in AHRF. Further emphasis on the significance of implementing the article is required.

R: Thank you very much for this suggestion. We added a new section in the Introduction as suggested.

4. Methods: “According to the predetermined protocol, a systematic literature search of 4 databases (MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane Library and PROSPERO) was performed from inception until May 5th 2021 in collaboration with a trained medical librarian.” Author should limited the period-from ... to... .

R: Thank you. We added the covering period as suggested.