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	

Review Form 1.7

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)*

Compulsory REVISION comments
 	
1. **Is the manuscript important for scientific community?**
(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)
 	
2. **Is the title of the article suitable?**
(If not please suggest an alternative title)
 	
3. **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?**
 	
4. **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?**
 	
5. **Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?**
 	
6. **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.**
 	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)
	1. **The manuscript explores the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in the field of anaesthesia, specifically focusing on remote pre-operative assessment and perioperative care. The significance of this work lies in its comprehensive analysis of the potential benefits and challenges associated with AI-driven anaesthesia, offering valuable insights for healthcare professionals, researchers, and policymakers. By addressing the implications of AI in the critical phases of anaesthesia, the manuscript contributes to the ongoing dialogue on leveraging technology to enhance patient care and safety in a rapidly evolving healthcare landscape. The exploration of ethical considerations, data security, and the interdisciplinary nature of AI and medicine further underscores the manuscript's importance for the scientific community, providing a thoughtful examination of the complexities surrounding the adoption of AI in anaesthesia.**
	
	2. **The title, "The Pros and Cons of the Impact of Artificial Intelligence in Anesthesia: Remote Pre-operative Assessment and Perioperative Care," effectively conveys the focus of the manuscript. However, it could be refined for conciseness and clarity.**
	
	Suggested Alternative Title:
	"Navigating AI in Anesthesia: Advantages and Challenges in Remote Pre-Op Assessment and Perioperative Care"
	
	This alternative title maintains the essence of the original while streamlining the wording for a more concise and accessible presentation.
	
	3. **Yes, the abstract of the article is generally comprehensive. It provides a succinct overview of the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in anesthesia, specifically focusing on remote pre-operative assessment and perioperative care. The abstract outlines the positive aspects of AI in terms of efficiency, precision, personalized interventions, and decision support, while also addressing challenges such as data security, privacy concerns, overreliance on AI systems, and the interdisciplinary gap between AI engineers and medical professionals.**
	
	4. **No, Ensure that subsections are clearly defined, and there is a logical flow between sections. Headings and subheadings should be descriptive, aiding readers in understanding the content. Each subsection should contribute to the overall coherence of the manuscript, helping to convey the research effectively.**
	
	5. **As a text-based AI, I don't have the capability to access the content of the manuscript directly. Therefore, I can't assess the scientific accuracy of the manuscript. To determine the scientific correctness, you should carefully review the content, ensuring that the information presented aligns with established scientific knowledge, methodologies, and ethical standards in the field of AI in anesthesia. Consider the following steps:**
	
	   i. **Verify that the research methodology and data analysis are sound and align with best practices in the field.**
	   ii. **Cross-reference the findings with existing literature to ensure consistency and accuracy.**
	
	6. **The references provided cover a range of sources, including journal articles, books, and conference papers. The inclusion of recent studies, such as those from 2022 and**	

	2023, reflects an effort to incorporate up-to-date literature. However, the assessment of sufficiency depends on the depth and breadth of the manuscript and the specific requirements of the research.	

Minor REVISION comments
 	
1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**
	Based on the provided snippets of the manuscript, the language and English quality seem generally suitable for scholarly communication. The sentences are well-structured, and the terminology used appears appropriate for an academic audience. However, a thorough evaluation of language and writing quality would require access to the complete manuscript.
	
	If possible, consider the following steps to ensure the language quality:
	
	   i. Grammar and Syntax:
	
	Double-check for grammatical accuracy and sentence structure. Ensure that there are no typographical errors.
	
	   ii. Clarity and Coherence:
	
	Ensure that ideas are presented in a clear and coherent manner. Use transitions effectively to guide the reader through different sections.	

Optional/General comments	Proof read it once.	

<mark>**PART 2:**</mark>

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**T. Aditya Sai Srinivas**
Department, University & Country	**Jayaprakash Narayan College of Engineering, India**