

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_106056
Title of the Manuscript:	Full recovery without complications by early intervention for malignant hyperthermia that occurred during general anesthesia: A case series of two infants with facial anomaly
Type of the Article	Case Report

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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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 the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript you presented is of importance to the scientific community, since severe complications in children are always of paramount concern. The manuscript you presented has a title depicting exactly what you wanted to convey to the readers but a bit long in my opinion (I suggest you remove without complication since full recovery means just that – it is redundant. Also, 2 cases are not considered a case series and just case reports – please substitute “A case series of two infants...” with “Two case reports of infants...”), the abstract is comprehensive, the structure of the manuscript is appropriate and the facts presented seem scientifically correct.</p> <p>My suggestions for improving your manuscript are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There are a few mistakes, both spelling and grammar, but with no impact on the understanding of the text – Please English proof the manuscript Please extend the Discussion section – provide additional details on etiologic and pathogenic elements of malignant hyperthermia, on current prevention methods and treatment options available, on clinic and paraclinical ways of diagnosing the condition, on evolution in absence of treatment and the context of this complication in children in general compared to adults, and in children with facial anomalies in particular (relevant literature should be cited). Also, you refer to a “MH Clinical Grading Scale” – please provide full grading system as a table. The reference list is very scarce and very old – just 10 biographic references and only 3 from the last 5 years. In my opinion a serious revision of the relevant bibliography needs to be included in the discussion section of the manuscript. <p>With major revision this manuscript will be of great value to the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language /English quality is suitable for scholarly communication. There are only a few minor mistakes easily correctable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I my opinion this manuscript will meet the requirements for being published after major revision.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chitoran Elena
Department, University & Country	Oncology Institute “Prof. Dr. Alexandru Trestioreanu”, Romania