

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_105536
Title of the Manuscript:	MANAGING TRACHEOSTOMIES UNDER ANESTHESIA IN THE EMERGENCY ROOM: A LITERATURE REVIEW
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.journalajmpcp.com/index.php/AJMPCP/editorial-policy>)

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes , it is important to know the complications, its frequency and prognosis in different methods of Tracheostomy 2. Has to be more precise "Managing Tracheostomy " needs to be replaced with a more objective terminology . 3. It's a little vague as the objective is not well defined , simply to summarize what is observed does not attract the reader there should be a hypothesis . 4. It can be made more attractive by adding in some figures and tables. 5. Yes , but the presentation should be more in tables then text so information is delivered quickly and easy to understand 6. References don't have DOI , all doesn't follow Vancouver style. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Should be more scientific , no casual sentences some are highlighted .	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Saera Suhail Kidwai
Department, University & Country	Fazaia Ruth Pfau Medical College, Pakistan