

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_106417
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of the Effects of Open and Closed Endotracheal Suction Systems on Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia and Mortality
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.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	yes	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	recent references are few, adding more recent and relevant references is recommended	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	there is discrepancy in no of patient of the study. In material method 205 patients are mentioned whereas in results 203 patients are mentioned	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	"The study was conducted through retrospective analysis of data from patients in the Reanimation Intensive Care Unit (RICU), which contains 20 of our tertiary hospital's 1,400 beds." This is starting line of material and methods, whereas author says it is single centre study in limitation of the study, again there is a discrepancy. In results Table 1 does not depicts incidence of VAP whereas in it is mentioned in writing that incidence of VAP are depicted in Table 1, incidence table is missing	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is highly recommended to have the paper grammar-checked and undergo stylistics and editing.	
Optional/General comments	Please follow the journal guidelines.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bhawana Rastogi
Department, University & Country	Swami Vivekananda Subharti University, India