

**Paper: “Factores Pronósticos De La Saturación De Oxígeno En Pacientes Con COVID-19 Atendidos En Cuidados Intensivos En Un Hospital De México”**

**Submitted: 24 November 2021**

**Accepted: 09 February 2022**

**Published: 31 May 2022**

Corresponding Author: Jesús Emmanuel Corres González

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n17p140](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n17p140)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Eliazar González Carrillo  
Universidad Autónoma de Chihuahua, México

Reviewer 2: Blinded

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Date Manuscript Received: 05/06/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 11/06/2022
Manuscript Title: Factores pronósticos de saturación de oxígeno según gasometría arterial en pacientes COVID-19 atendidos en terapia intensiva	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 33.05.2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The title should be:</i>	

<i>Prognostic factors of oxygen saturation in patients with COVID-19 attended in intensive care in a hospital in Mexico</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The abstract should be clear as to the number of samples studied (165 or 75?). Abbreviations (PaFI?) should not be included.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Correct the few grammatical errors contained in the document</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Clarify whether data from 165 patients were analyzed or a sample size (75?) was calculated.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Include tables summarizing the multiple linear regression model that was performed.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>State the limitations of the study in both its internal and external validity.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Date Manuscript Received: 6-05-2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 15-05-2022
Manuscript Title: <b>Prognostic factors of oxygen saturation according to arterial blood gases in COVID-19 patients in intensive care.</b>	
<b>ESJ 0533/22</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/no	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>El título es coherente con el contenido del manuscrito</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Presenta introducción método, resultados solo el objetivo me parece un poco confuso y requiere de revisar redacción se realizaron algunos cambios.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Requiere revisar redacción hay algunas palabras repetidas innecesarias ya se realizaron algunos cambios para mejorarla.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>El método menciona que es analítico descriptivo observacional y posteriormente en los resultados aparece que se construyó un modelo de regresión lineal para determinar la forma de funcionalidad de las variables predictoras por medio de la varianza ANOVA sin embargo los resultados no se muestran.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Los resultados describen lo revelado en el estudio sin embargo no están descritos en las tablas ni en la parte superior ni inferior que indiquen cuales son los datos más importantes sobresalientes y tampoco indican la fuente.( se le colocó según como lo mencionan en el escrito).</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Las conclusiones son claras y están acorde con los resultados</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Las referencias están de acuerdo al estilo APA solo que están numeradas y no tienen sangría Francesa y algunas les falta el Link para su verificación.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Regresar a los autores para que revisen de una manera exhaustiva la redacción, en la introducción les falta definir las variables la independiente y dependiente y como mencioné el objetivo me parece confuso pudieran mejorar la redacción.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**