

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Medicine and Health |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJMAH_125708 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A PROSPECTIVE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF BASKA MASK Vs I-GEL IN SHORT ELECTIVE SURGERIES UNDER GENERAL ANAESTHESIA |
| Type of the Article | |

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory 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>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the comparative efficacy of the Baska mask and I-gel, both of which are increasingly used in airway management during general anesthesia. Its relevance lies in the study's ability to highlight the superiority of the Baska mask in terms of airway sealing pressure, which can be critical in ensuring patient safety during positive pressure ventilation. By comparing these two devices, the study contributes to clinical decision-making in anesthesia, particularly for short surgical procedures. I appreciate the clarity of the results and the clinical relevance of the findings.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>The current title is somewhat broad. A more precise title could be: "A Comparative Study of Baska Mask and I-gel for Airway Management in Elective Surgeries: Focus on Airway Sealing Pressure, Insertion Time, and Hemodynamic Response" This better reflects the focus and parameters being evaluated in the study.</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>The abstract is comprehensive and summarizes the key findings effectively. However, you may want to mention in the methods section that the sample size was 90 patients, as this is a critical detail. Additionally, stating the randomization technique used in the study would add clarity. Otherwise, the abstract covers all relevant sections including results and conclusions well.</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The subsections of the manuscript are well-structured and logical. The flow from introduction to methods, results, and conclusions is appropriate for a scientific manuscript. The study could benefit from a Discussion section where the findings are compared with existing literature to highlight the study's contribution more clearly.</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>The manuscript appears scientifically robust. The prospective comparative design is appropriate for this type of research, and the statistical methods (t-tests and chi-square tests) are correctly applied to analyze the data. The sample size seems reasonable, and the inclusion of key parameters such as time of insertion, airway sealing pressure, and hemodynamic changes ensures the technical soundness of the study. By focusing on objective measurements, the study provides clear, actionable conclusions for clinical practice.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p> | <p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust. The prospective comparative design is appropriate for this type of research, and the statistical methods (Student t-tests and chi-square tests) are correctly applied to analyze the data. The sample size seems reasonable, and the inclusion of key parameters such as time of insertion, airway sealing pressure, and hemodynamic changes ensures the technical soundness of the study. By focusing on objective measurements, the study provides clear, actionable conclusions for clinical practice.</p> <p>Ensure recent studies: While some references date back to 2004 and 2005, it is important to include more current studies (within the last 5 years) that focus on newer advancements or large-scale trials comparing supraglottic airway devices. You might want to include the latest studies on Baska mask and I-gel devices from 2020 onwards.</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The English quality is adequate for scholarly communication, but a few minor edits in grammar and phrasing could further improve its readability. | |
| Optional/General comments | Optional/General Comments: The study provides clinically important data, but it would be beneficial to include a limitations section discussing any potential biases or limitations related to the sample size or study design. Adding more context about the practical implications of using these devices in various surgical settings could also enhance the discussion. | |

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: | Digant Jansari |
| Department, University & Country | Medcare Orthopedic and Spine Hospital, UAE |