

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &amp; Health</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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 physicican based survey</p> <p>GP is included in the endoscopy process ( ? how is he involved in sedation process) So as dietician</p>	
<b>Minor</b> 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>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Postives : Good area of improvement is highlighted</p>	

### **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:	Zaka Ur Rab Siddiqui
Department, University & Country	Saudi Arabia