

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_85106
Title of the Manuscript:	A RETROSPECTIVE OBSERVATIONAL STUDY TO ASSESS THE SAFETY AND FEASIBILITY OF PERCUTANEOUS DILATATIONAL TRACHEOSTOMY PERFORMED BY TRAINEES.
Type of the 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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy> )

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b> Reviewer Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is a retrospective study.</li><li>• Overall objective</li><li>• Specific objectives not indicated</li></ul>	<p><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></p>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments Comentarios de REVISIÓN obligatoria</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Comparative, open study -not randomized, not blinded-, retrospective, cross-sectional, with a probabilistic and single-centre sample size. It seems that this is a case-control study, which has methodological limitations.</li><li>• Regarding the statistical analysis, there is a lack of data to understand what happened with the comparison of means since they are numerical, and to know if there was no normality of the data of the variables, for which a non-parametric analysis was carried out - U of Mann Whitney-, and not T for independent groups. On the other hand, it is not described in which variables the Chi-Square was applied and if it reported statistical significance. The safety variables mentioned in the text were not presented, much less analyzed.</li></ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments Comentarios menores de REVISIÓN</p>	<p>The reports in the tables are very concise, they do not infer much information, especially since in one study group the maneuver was performed by practitioners with little experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The behavior of safety variables, such as hypoxia, are not fully reported. It would be interesting to know how the oxygen saturation behaved throughout the procedure, so as to be able to suggest that it is a reliable technique in the hands of doctors in training. The bibliography is very poor and should be broader in order to compare the results of the study.</li></ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments Comentarios opcionales / generales</p>	<p>The study has little internal validity; with good external validity due to its methodological design, however, it is necessary to be more insistent on monitoring security variables.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	José Luis Carranza Cortés
Department, University & Country	Unidad de Cirugía Ambulatoria, México