

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_96614
Title of the Manuscript:	Awake video laryngoscope guided intubation (VLI) in a case of advanced Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in thereview form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. Definitely if pursued in a justified manner.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Can be little shorter.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. I have already mentioned few important questions to be answered.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. In Keywords, T is missing from tracheostomy.</p> <p>2. The 62 year patient was administered fentanyl 100mcg, propofol 200mg and cisatracurium 5mg on which basis? What was the weight of the patient to calculate the administered dose?</p> <p>2. Even after administration of these drugs especially propofol whose induction dose in >55 years is 1.5 to 2mg/kg body weight, how come the patient was awake?</p> <p>4. With so much high dose of induction agent and muscle relaxant how the oxygenation level was maintained ? Definitely a surgical tracheostomy would have taken some time,which is not mentioned.</p> <p>5. What was the emergency plan to save the patient if even after tracheostomy would have been failed???</p> <p>To validate the case report all the necessary information required are to be added by the author.</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:	Nihar Ranjan Tripathy
Department, University & Country	Dhh Malkangiri, India