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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this retrospective study, the authors analyzed the clinical data such as the treatment process and final outcome of 27 severe and critical COVID-19 patients who were treated with mechanical ventilation. The study is set up correctly. Your study is a well-written, good structured recommendation for the prognosis of COVID-19. The recommendations are good for clinical use. The experiment of the study is designed very well, aims are very clear. Methods are reasonable. Data in figures and tables are very good, and well discussed. Thank you for giving opportunity to review your study. However, some concerns have been noted including: 1. The full text of the manuscript has provided too little background information about COVID-19, and I suggest that it be enriched. 2. The presentation of the results section can be more organized, and the description of Figure 1 is too simple to be more detailed. 3. Fig. 1 is not clear. The image resolution must be 300dpi so that the details are not lost when minimized or enlarged. In general, this article is a guide for future work. It should be published and shared data as soon as possible. Hence, it can be helped to provide the clinical treatment. BEST REGARDS
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
I read with interest the article by Jia Zeng and colleagues. I think that the manuscript has important value, as COVID-19 has become a critical challenge to global health. The authors study the influencing factors of mechanical ventilation efficacy in severe and critical COVID-19 patients. They found that the age, blood glucose, cardiac and renal function and inflammatory reaction are important indicators of poor prognosis for mechanical ventilation in severe and critical COVID-19 patients. The BACKGROUND part of the text is well written and presents status and significance of the study clearly. However, I suggest that more basic knowledge of COVID-19, such as epidemiology and prevalence, should be introduced in the background introduction. The study provided valuable information to improve the understanding of COVID-19 and to provide reference for clinical treatment. I recommend accepting this manuscript for publication after a minor editing.