

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology</a>
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.	Like: honesty in reporting, establishes additional importance of postprocedure CXR Dislike: no mention of the patient's outcome	We have added patients' outcomes.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Did the patient INGEST? Maybe replace with accidental entry into esophagus...	
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.	OK	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	OK	
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.	It documents a rare event during one of the commonest procedures in hospitals. It is a straightforward report describing a complication, but it doesnot necessarily have any robustness inherently attached to it. However, it looks good on the whole	We have added and described about MACOCHA score and added clinical aspects.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	OK	
Minor REVISION comments	English needs to be thoroughly revised.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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>	