

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_126222
Title of the Manuscript:	Accidental Ingestion of Laryngoscope Bulb During Emergency Endotracheal Intubation: A Rare Event
Type of the Article	Case report

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<div>1. This is an important article highlighting a rare but dreadful complication of laryngoscopy all endoscopists should be aware of.</div> <div>2. The article does not give any clinical parameters of the patient to elaborate the condition of the patient and why immediate intubation was decided up on.</div> <div>3. The citation method followed does not number the references in sequence.</div>	We have added clinical parameters of patients where there is a need of immediate intubation.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<div>1. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive</div> <div>2. Once multiple co morbidities is mentioned there is no need to name each one of them separately.</div> <div>3. At least the vital parameters particularly the oxygen saturation figure should be mentioned in the abstract to justify invasive procedure for resuscitation.</div>	Corrected on page 1, 2
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<div>1. The per laryngoscopy findings of the airway should be described in brief to correlate the MACOCHA and CORMACK LEHANE classification.</div> <div>2. Suggest spelling correction for MACOCHA instead of MOCOCHA.</div> <div>3. The references highlighted are not in sequence in contravention of the Vancouver style.</div>	We have added on page 1 Spelling corrected References are modified as suggested
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<div>1. Scientifically the manuscript lacks the data of the clinical parameters of the patient.</div> <div>2. There is no clinical or radiological data to support the clinical status of the patient.</div> <div>3. Though the clinical problem highlighted is of concern but lack of clinical data cannot justify the robustness of the topic mentioned.</div> <div>4. A pre and post procedural scientific data must highlight the advantage of the interventional procedure and then mention the risk factors involved.</div> <div>5. The moment the bulb goes missing during the procedure of laryngoscopy it will be obvious to the anaesthesiologist and he must immediately initiate procedure to retrieve the lost laryngoscope part.</div>	All comments have done according to reviewer suggestion.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<div>1. References are just sufficient for a case reporting.</div> <div>2. Further literature search scope is there.</div> <div>3. The sequence of mention of the references need to be relooked into.</div>	
Minor REVISION comments	For a scholarly article the language quality may be relooked in to.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	A good topic, as a case reporting the clinical parameters of the patient on receipt, the justification of the investigations asked for their findings explaining the pathology and the solutions thought of should have been brought forth. Justification of intervention and the parameters then would be a lesson for others to learn. The final out come of the patient must always be clearly depicted with clinical and radiological evident data to justify the procedure undertaken.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	