

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_105456
Title of the Manuscript:	THE IMPORTANCE OF PERCUTANEOUS TRACHEOSTOMY IN CRITICAL CARE FOR IMPROVING PATIENT PROGNOSIS
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> <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 the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Absolutely NOT.</p> <p>No. The title is about prognosis, but the article is about the technique.</p> <p>NO. It is simply copy-paste sentences from the discussion. They are irrelevant, and incoherent.</p> <p>NO, especially the introduction. Most of the introduction is irrelevant. The rest of the article is merely general information.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Mostly yes.</p> <p>Please forgive me if my comments seem harsh. I have the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- This article doesn't provide any addition to current knowledge. 2- The abstract is simply some sentences copied and pasted from the introduction. They are – therefore- incoherent and don't provide any meaning. 3- The introduction: The first 3 and half paragraphs are totally irrelevant to the topic. If they are removed, you end up with 13 lines in the introduction. 4- There nothing in the article about a methodology. 5- The main section of the article (about the technique) is of poor content, it is similar to information in patients' handouts, or a Wikipedia page. 6- You claimed that you will review the rising rates of tracheostomy, but you didn't. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Needs proofreading, particularly for the grammar and punctuation errors.	
<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:	Waleed Aletreby
Department, University & Country	Saudi Arabia