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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an excellent article that I read with great pleasure. My only remark is that both in the literature and in real life, as well as in this article, the producer's responsibility when placing a non-recyclable product on the market is under-emphasized. Some of them do not represent a significant advance in the performance of the device. Healthcare legislators and those who are responsible for putting the product on the market in certain countries should be aware of that moment. I suggest a minor change with a note on the manufacturer's responsibility.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
I read with great interest the manuscript entitled "Improving environmental sustainability of intensive care units: a mini-review". The premise is based on a pertinent but often ignored topic. The manuscript is well written but I would suggest to add a table on clinical practices which may aid in reducing the environmental contamination. This may act as an easy reckoner to the readers.