

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_86117
Title of the Manuscript:	INCIDENCE OF DIFFICULT INTUBATION IN TMJ ANKYLOSIS PATIENTS IN UNIVERSITY SETTING.
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major grammatical errors which need correction</li> <li>Abstract- Aim- what was the criteria of difficult intubation? Methods- a. The difficult intubation would be expected in TMJ ankylosis. The plan of intubation would be formulated in preanesthetic check up itself, so by difficult intubation, what does authors mean? b. Was retrograde intubation not included? Results- Chi square test was used for which variable? Need to mention in statistical language.</li> <li>Introduction- References 14-33 , what is the meaning of the statement cited. Does the authors wants to describe their publications? If so wouldn't it be bias and not allowed to do so?</li> <li>Results- the order of describing result of difficult intubation should either be decreasing order or increasing order. It seems unorganised i.e 33.33, 25 and 41.67. it would be advised to rewrite it.</li> <li>The incidence of more fiberoptic intubation in male population needs explanation. Since the institute has fiberoptic intubation and it is also being practised by the anesthesiologist , why this bias?</li> <li>Discussion needs to be rewritten as same lines has been mentioned over and again.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Whole manuscript needs serious grammatical corrections.	

### 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:	Sakshi Kadian
Department, University & Country	AIIMS, India