

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_125419
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Comparison Between Effectiveness of Intravenous Magnesium Sulphate and Dexmedetomidine on Attenuation of Haemodynamic Stress Response to Laryngoscopy and Endotracheal Intubation: A Randomised Control Trail</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p><b>Peer Review File</b>  <b>INTRODUCTION</b>                      The word reaction should be removed as these are haemodynamic responses to sympathetic activation.                      In the last paragraph, there is a paucity of research especially from india- which cannot be quantified as there is no such data available about how much literature is available on a particular topic.  <b>MATERIAL AND METHODS</b>                      The last paragraph describing complications  <b>Complications like hypotension, bradycardia and desaturation were noted with the definition</b>                      Desaturation - oxygen saturation less than 90%. And if the patient get desaturates, supplemented with 100% O<sub>2</sub> through face mask.  <b>Comment-</b> But we are already inducing the patient, therefore we should not use face mask, we have to do bag mask ventilation with bair circuit or closed circuit.</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION:</b></p> <p>We performed a randomised control trial to evaluate the effectiveness and complications of magnesium sulphate and dexmedetomidine in attenuating hemodynamic stress response, where we noted that the sociodemographic and anatomical factors associated with difficult spinal anaesthesia among women who deliver through caesarean section in a tertiary care institute. We finally found that anatomical factors played a major deterministic role in predicting difficult spinal anaesthesia  <b>Comment</b> – The First paragraph is irrelevant to the study.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>		
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ruchika Kathuria</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Maharaja Agrasen Medical College, India</b>