

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_84516
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Sedation and Monitoring for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy among Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Practitioners in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Almost 30 percent of the subjects are in practice less than a year. This observation limits the validity of the study</p> <p>Practice and outcome should be judged by patients' perspective rather than practioner perspective</p> <p>No response forms should be excluded from the study</p> <p>Study should focuss on the centre based survey rather than physician based survey</p> <p>GP is included in the endoscopy process (? how is he involved in sedation process) So as dietician</p>	<p>Gastrointestinal endoscopy practice in our setting is still young and up-coming, this explains why the number is smaller. It is therefore what it is, and does not negate the findings in the study.</p> <p>There are different perspectives of practice and outcome of which the patients' perspectives is one. The health providers'/practitioners' perspective also does exist and also provides useful information. The focus of this study is the evaluation of sedation practice from the health practitioners' point of view in our young GI endoscopic practice.</p> <p>The participants were conference attendees, and a hybrid data collection was done. We did not have significant none response.</p> <p>Both centre-based and physician-based studies have their advantages and limitations. Our study provides a panoramic view of the sedation practice in our young GI endoscopy practice.</p> <p>On a strict sense sir/madam, General Practitioners are not gastroenterologists, but in our young evolving practice some of them are involved in the practice hence their presence in the national conference of Gastroenterologists and Hepatologists in Nigeria. Some of these GPs own the practice and participate in the procedures, hence their opinion could not be excluded. It is an opinion study, and hence an acknowledged limitation.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Spelling and grammatical errors should be corrected (such as Anathesia .. etc) P value to be written for all correlations</p> <p>Sample size inadequate</p> <p>What is the definition of adequate endoscopy (reaching terminal ileum ? last part of duodenum)</p> <p>Upper and lower GI failure rates and reasons should be detailed !! Any other factors (other than sedatives like old age , complex procedure , patient factors) can bias the results</p> <p>Results are base on estimations and not on a valid data</p>	<p>This correction has been done.</p> <p>The sample size is limited to the number available at the conference – relatively small number of practitioners.</p> <p>This statement is correct as this is a questionnaire-based study.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Postives : Good area of improvement is highlighted</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	