

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_110668
Title of the Manuscript:	THE PROS AND CONS OF THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ANESTHESIA: REMOTE PRE-OPERATIVE ASSESSMENT AND PERIOPERATIVE CARE
Type of the Article	

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The article reviewed Importance and limitation of AI in the area of anesthesia.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the content within the finding, which primarily focuses on the role of Artificial Intelligence in Anesthesia, particularly in the preoperative state of a patient. The content discusses the integration of AI in Anesthesia, the advantages and challenges associated with AI-driven Anesthesia. The title is innovative and it is the application of AI technology to Health sector specifically to Anesthesia. But, I suggest an alternative title as: <b>THE IMPACT/ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ANESTHESIA: REMOTE PRE-OPERATIVE ASSESSMENT AND PERIOPERATIVE.</b></p> <p><b>3. Comments Regarding the Abstract.</b> To some extent, the abstract of the article is comprehensive as it provides a clear overview of Artificial Intelligence in Anesthesia, specifically in remote pre-operative assessment and perioperative care, and highlights the advantages and challenges associated with its integration. But the abstract lacks method used in the article and must be addressed by the researcher. The authors should summarize the important details of the finding clearly.</p> <p><b>4. Comments on Subsection and structure of the manuscript appropriate</b> The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. The content is organized into relevant subsections such as Introduction, Pros and Cons of AI in Anesthesia, and Conclusion. But as seen the article lacks subsection such as, Comparison of Traditional vs. AI-Enabled Anesthesia, Ethical Considerations, Future Prospects and Potential barriers to widespread adoption. It will be good to add those listed subsection in the findings.</p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> The article cites several references from reputable sources, including peer-reviewed journals. Therefore, I can say the manuscript is scientifically right.</p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> The references provided in the manuscript appear to be both recent and relevant to the topic of Artificial Intelligence in anesthesia. However, to further support the manuscript, it may be positive to consider additional references (from <b>Scopus indexed Journal</b>) that specifically address integration of AI in anesthesia, as well as latest progresses in AI technology within the field of medicine.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>The title has been changed accordingly.</p> <p>Acknowledged.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The article presents information in a clear and concise manner, which is essential for scholarly communication.</li></ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>	