

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77749

Title: Pressure changes in tapered and cylindrical shaped cuff after extension of head and neck: A randomized controlled trial

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04427657

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Physician, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-20

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-27 03:12

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-28 09:45

Review time: 1 Day and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng **Publishing**

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

Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study aimed to compare the cuff pressure between tapered and cylindrical cuff after extension of head and neck in patients underwent nasal endotracheal intubation. And the authors conclude that cuff pressure significantly increases in tapered cuff, compared to cylindrical cuff after extension of head and neck in patients underwent nasal intubation. In addition, the extent of cephalad migration of tube tip is significantly greater in tapered cuff than in cylindrical cuff. It was interesting. However, I have some comments. 1. The necessity and hypothesis of this study should be mentioned in the Introduction. 2. The authors should give a concise explanation about American Society of Anesthesiologists physical status classification I-III. 3. The endotracheal tubes with different cuffs should be given as images. 4. The status of nasal conventional ET and TaperGuard ET should also be described using diagrams. 5. The paragraph "A pilot study..." should be listed under Statistical analysis section. 6. The sentence "This study was approved..." should be transferred to the last of the paragraph. And the designing and the place of this present study should be involved at the first of this paragraph. 7. Why was the student's t test used? Please gave some explanations. 8. The relevant mechanisms were not very clear. Please gave more explanations.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77749

Title: Pressure changes in tapered and cylindrical shaped cuff after extension of head and neck: A randomized controlled trial

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05402115

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-20

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-29 06:37

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-29 07:27

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title- write the type of study at the end of the title. Like - Comparison of cuff pressure between TaperGuard nasal endotracheal tube and conventional nasal endotracheal tube after extension of head and neck : A randomized controlled trial Introduction Elaborate the hypothesis in detail. Discussion Therefore, when inflated in the trachea, more longitudinal folds developed in the cylindrical cuff than in the cylindrical cuff, leading to a significant prevention of microaspiration and pneumonia with TaperGuard ET, compared with conventional ET[8,16,17]. Rewrite it. The cephalad migration of ET occurs after extension of head and neck during orally or nasally endotracheal intubation[10,11]. Rewrite it – it will be oral or nasal endotracheal intubation. Mention the implications of the study Mention the direction for future research Conclusion What you want to recommend from the study.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases Manuscript NO: 77749 Title: Pressure changes in tapered and cylindrical shaped cuff after extension of head and neck: A randomized controlled trial Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed Peer-review model: Single blind **Reviewer's code:** 04427657 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD Professional title: Chief Physician, Professor Reviewer's Country/Territory: China Author's Country/Territory: South Korea Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-20 Reviewer chosen by: Kai-Le Chang Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-01 03:17 Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-01 03:26 Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous





statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has been greatly improved after revisions. I have no additional comments.