



Paper: “An Ethical Dilemma in SARS-Cov-2 Pandemic : Who Gets the Ventilator?”

Corresponding Author: Raluca Dumache

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n21p24

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luis Aliaga, Spain

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 31.07.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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!

Reviewer Name: Luis Aliaga	Email:
University/Country: Spain	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/05/20	Date Review Report Submitted: 02/06/20
Manuscript Title: An ethical dilemma in SARS-CoV-2 pandemic: who gets the ventilation?	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0641/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The title is pertinent with the content of the paper.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

The abstract is appropriate	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The English is too correct. The authors should change in the introduction “most” to “more”	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The article is an opinion review.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The paper is concise and interesting	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusions are correct.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The references are appropriate. However, if the authors use the Harvard’s system for referencing, the references should be ordered in alphabetical order. In any way, the references must adapt to the rules of ESJ. Minor modifications should be made in the following references: 2. “de” changes to “De”. “van” changes to “Van”. 4. “resuscitation” changes to “Resuscitation”. 6. “146:4 Suppl” changes to “146(Suppl. 4):”. 12. “what” changes to “What”. 18. “146:4 Suppl.” changes to 146(Suppl. 4):”. 21. (2) should be deleted.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the introduction SARS and MERS are not pandemic, but only outbreak and this concept should be changed (line 10).

The paper is concise, interesting and offers an useful information.