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Author’s response to reviews:

Re: Manuscript No. BANE-D-19-00714 “Predictors of 1-year mortality in patients on prolonged mechanical ventilation after surgery in intensive care unit: a multicenter, retrospective cohort study”

Dear Dr. Spadaro,

Thanks very much for giving us the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript. The reviewers’ comments and suggestions have been carefully considered, and we are now submitting the revised version. All changes are indicated in red font. Please find attached below our point-by-point responses to the reviewers’ comments.

We hope this revised version is worthy of publication in your distinguished journal.
Happy new year!

Yours sincerely,

Shuangling Li
Department of Critical Care Medicine, Peking University First Hospital, Beijing 100034, China
Email: lishuangling888@hotmail.com

Reviewers Comments:

(Reviewer 1): I am satisfied with the authors responses and changes.

1. I just want to suggest to check English spelling and grammar for the sentence on tracheostomy (Page 14 lines 23-30), which is difficult to understand in the current form.
   Response: Thank you very much for your comment and we agree with it. The correction has been revised in the manuscript (Page 13, lines 28-32). “Requirement” has been replaced by “use” and “21” by “21st”.

2. I suggest to clarify whether the ROC curve (Figure 2) is based on the combination of all the 6 independent predictors of death.
   Response: Thank you very much for your comment and we agree with it. The clarification has been added in the revised manuscript (Page 12, Lines 38-42).

(Reviewer 2): The Authors now present a revised version of their manuscript. Overall, the Authors adequately replied to my comments. However, in most cases, they limited to reply but did not modify manuscript accordingly.

Please edit the discussion and the limitation section of the manuscript according to issue I raised (e.g. comparison with ProVent score)

Response: Thank you very much for your comment and we agree with it. The content has been added in the revised manuscript. The added content included that “the effects of the combination of our multivariate factors and the ProVent score in predicting 1-year survival in patients with PMV were compared using the receiver operator characteristic (ROC) curves and the area under the curve (AUC)” in statistical analysis (Page 10, Lines 40-48), “There was significant difference between the combination of our multivariate factors and the ProVent Score in predicting 1-year mortality in these patients with PMV after surgery (area under curve [AUC] 0.81 [95% CI 0.72-0.89] vs. 0.69 [95% CI 0.58-0.80]; P<0.01) (Figure 2)” in results (Page 12, Lines 44-54), and “there was significant difference between the ProVent score and the combination of our multivariate factors in predicting 1-year survival using ROC curves (area under curve [AUC] 0.81 [95% CI 0.72-0.89] vs. 0.69 [95% CI 0.58-0.80]; P<0.001), however, the sample size was relatively small and the comparison might be unconvincing” in the discussion (Page 15, Lines 18-30).