

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_97793
Title of the Manuscript:	OTOLARYNGOLOGY EMERGENCIES IN THE ELDERLY IN PORT HARCOURT, 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.journalajmcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The subject of the manuscript is interesting, but it needs to be corrected to be suitable for publishing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject of the manuscript is important 2. Title is suitable 3. Below mentioned corrections are needed in Abstract 4. Structure is correct 5. Discussion must be more detailed according to the method section 6. References are appropriate but need to be uniformly cited! 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Abstract Background: please rewrite the first sentence By the age of 65 years and above when there are changes in physiological process, different health challenges are observed in this age group INTO At the age of 65 years and above, beside physiological changes, different health challenges can be observed. Method: Please rephrase the first sentence INTO This is a six year retrospective study (January 2017 – December 2022) of 90... Result section in main manuscript- when citing the author Ibekwe et al please add a reference number, please write the correct tracheostomy instead trachesotomy TABLE I- please correct the terms Otitis externa, septal hemathoma, please exclude the term to Hypertension sinonasal lesion after epistaxis (you can just comment it in the text). TABLE II –please write esophageal foreign body instead foreign body oesophagus without the type of foreign body (add it in the text), in cases of dyspnoea due to the tumor- write dyspnoea due to the tumor (laryngeal, hypopharyngeal) not just stating the tumor since if not causing breathing difficulties it is not an emergency Cut throat injury should be rephrased- cut wound of the neck Discussion is insufficient- since you stated in Patient and method section that the treatment and outcome are also analyzed, you need to add a comment how these emergencies were treated. Conclusion: The conclusion must arise from the results. The last sentence "Obstruction to the aerodigestive pathway need very urgent attention if patient must be alive." is not suitable for medical manuscripts. Please rephrase- point out that these causes require urgent airway management . References- please cite them uniformly</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>After the suggested corrections, it can be reconsidered for publication.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Danijela Dragicevic
Department, University & Country	University of Novi Sad, Serbia