



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**Manuscript NO:** 67470

**Title:** Role of nitrous oxide in contemporary paediatric anaesthesia

**Reviewer's code:** 06060975

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Kenya

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-29 23:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-02 09:14

**Review time:** 2 Days and 9 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

What is the main focus of the manuscript? What is the rationale of the opinion paper?

What are the areas of feature studies you will suggest following your opinion ? What is impact of this publication to clinical practice?



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**Manuscript NO:** 67470

**Title:** Role of nitrous oxide in contemporary paediatric anaesthesia

**Reviewer's code:** 05278137

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-25 13:20

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-08 08:05

**Review time:** 12 Days and 18 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear Authors, evaluate the current role of nitrous oxide in paediatric anaesthesia is a good purpose. However, the paper in the current version has some major weaknesses. Some suggestions: - In the Introduction, the authors stated their objective is to discuss the present status of nitrous oxide in paediatric anaesthesia practice. However, the paper details the pharmacological characteristics of nitrous oxide but does not provide data on its current role in contemporary pediatric anaesthesia; - Methods are missing: selection criteria and critical analysis of literature research are not described; - In the paragraph Do we have a better alternative the authors state: "However, none of these has the beneficial property of amnesia analgesia of the degree offered by Nitrous oxide with comparable cardiovascular stability". This statement must be supported by bibliographic references. Are there any studies comparing the degree of amnesia or analgesia or cardiovascular stability between BDZ, opioids, alpha2 agonists to nitrous oxide? - Discussion is missing; - The bibliography is dated, I believe that this data needs to be commented on; - The Conclusion is non-specific, it must be rephrased after writing the Discussion. Minor requests: - The paragraph Metabolic effects is quite long and very detailed, it should be shortened; - Nitrous oxide use for procedural pain in children: the composition of the Entonox must be specified.



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**Manuscript NO:** 67470

**Title:** Current Status of Nitrous Oxide Use in Children

**Reviewer's code:** 05278137

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yun-Xiaojian Wu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-29 16:55

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-30 10:08

**Review time:** 17 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- Abstract and Core Tip haven't to be the same. The core tip is shorter than the abstract,



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

encompasses the authors' principle message. It should be engaging in creating interest in the reader. - Interaction with Anesthetic agents: the sentence "During inhalational induction with mask." is incomplete. - Sorry, but there are still many things to put in order: tables in the discussion, conclusions written twice...