



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: JNHM-072

Title: A Concise Overview of Anesthesia,

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision ...**YES**.....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			√	
Techn. Quality			√	
Clarity		√		
Significance			√	

Reviewer Name: PROF. DR DILLIP KUMAR MOHAPATRA

Detailed Reviewers Report

1. Strengths

Clear Structure and Organization

The manuscript is logically organized into sections: overview, general anesthesia, phases and stages, neuraxial and regional techniques, and conclusion.

Flow of information is systematic and easy to follow.

Comprehensive Basic Coverage

Key foundational concepts such as:

Anesthetic triad

Phases of general anesthesia

Guedel's classification

Jana Nexus: Journal of Health and Medicine

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

<https://www.jananexushm.com>

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Commonly used anesthetic drugs

These are essential topics for undergraduate or early postgraduate learners.

Educational Value

The article serves as a concise revision resource for students in medicine, nursing, or pharmacy.

References include standard textbooks such as:

Miller's Anesthesia

Clinical Anesthesiology

Clinical Relevance

Emphasis on drug selection and perioperative considerations enhances applied understanding.

2. Weaknesses

Lack of Originality

The manuscript presents textbook-level information without new insights, updated evidence, or novel interpretation.

No recent guidelines or consensus statements are discussed.

Absence of Critical Analysis

Content is descriptive rather than analytical.

No discussion on:

Recent advances (e.g., TIVA vs balanced anesthesia)

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS)

Ultrasound-guided regional anesthesia developments

Figure Copyright Concerns

Figures are taken from websites (URLs provided).

No mention of:

Permission obtained

Proper citation format

This may raise ethical and copyright issues.

Reference Issues

Some references are outdated (e.g., 1996, 2004).

Citation formatting inconsistencies.

Duplicate reference source (Morgan & Mikhail cited twice differently).

Language and Technical Editing

Minor grammatical issues.

Some redundancy (e.g., repeated explanation of GA components).

“Combined anesthesia” should be more precisely termed combined general–regional technique.

Not Fully Suitable as Short Communication

Short communications typically present:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Novel findings

Preliminary data

Technical innovations

This manuscript is more of a mini-review.

3. Significance

Educational significance: Moderate

Scientific novelty: Low

Clinical innovation: Minima

The manuscript is suitable for:

Undergraduate academic journals

Institutional bulletins

Educational magazines

It is **not suitable for high-impact anesthesiology journals** in its present form.

4. Key Points for Improvement

Add a section on:

Recent advancements in anesthesia

ERAS protocols

Ultrasound-guided regional anesthesia

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Patient safety and monitoring (e.g., BIS monitoring)

Remove externally sourced figures or:

Replace with original diagrams

Provide documented copyright permission

Update references (last 5–7 years preferred).

Improve critical discussion:

Compare techniques

Mention complications

Include brief evidence-based commentary

Revise language for academic precision and remove redundancies.

5. Overall Recommendation

Recommendation: Major Revision

Justification:

Scientifically accurate but lacks originality.

Needs updated references and analytical depth.

Ethical concerns regarding figure sources must be resolved.

JUSTIFICATION FOR MAJOR REVISION

Manuscript Title: "A Concise Overview of Anesthesia"

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Title (Line 4)

Comment:

The title is very broad and generic.

Justification for Revision:

Does not reflect novelty or a specific focus.

Consider revising to indicate scope (e.g., "Educational Review" or "Foundational Concepts for Clinical Practice").

Current title resembles textbook chapter heading.

Abstract (Lines 6-12)

Lines 6-8

Issue: Descriptive and general; lacks novelty statement.

Justification:

Abstract does not clarify why this overview is necessary.

No mention of target audience or gap addressed.

Add a rationale and concluding takeaway.

Lines 9-12

Issue: Concluding sentence is generic.

Justification:

"Essential for safe clinical practice" is a broad claim without support.

Add specific educational or clinical contribution.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Section: Anesthesia – A General Overview (Lines 14–21)

Lines 14–16

Issue: Definition closely resembles standard textbook descriptions.

Justification:

High risk of similarity with established textbooks such as
Miller's Anesthesia
Clinical Anesthesiology

Needs paraphrasing and citation refinement.

Lines 17–18

Issue: Classification is basic and lacks elaboration.

Justification:

No explanation of sedation spectrum.

Could incorporate ASA classification or modern sedation continuum.

Lines 20–21

Issue: Very brief description of anesthesiology scope.

Justification:

Expand to include perioperative medicine, pain management, critical care.

Modern anesthesiology is broader than drug delivery.

Section: General Anesthesia (Lines 23–38)

Lines 23–25

Issue: Definition is standard and widely published.

Justification:

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Requires updated references or inclusion of mechanism of action discussion.

Lines 26–28

Issue: No evidence-based references supporting statement.

Justification:

Needs citation of recent guidelines (last 5 years).

Lines 29–30 (Anesthetic Triad)

Issue: Classical concept presented without critical discussion.

Justification:

No mention of balanced anesthesia or TIVA.

Lacks integration with modern monitoring (e.g., BIS).

Lines 31–38 (Drug Discussion)

Issues:

Drug list is descriptive.

No comparative discussion.

No adverse effect profile.

Outdated references (1996, 2004).

Justification:

Include recent pharmacological updates.

Mention current trends such as opioid-sparing anesthesia.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Add evidence-based citations (2020–2025 preferred).

Figure 1 (Lines 47–48)

Issue: Figure sourced from commercial website.

Major Concern:

No copyright permission mentioned.

Web link citation is inappropriate for academic journal.

Ethical and publication integrity issue.

Justification:

Replace with original schematic.

Provide proper citation and permission documentation.

Phases and Stages of General Anesthesia (Lines 50–64)

Lines 50–57

Issue: Descriptive, no clinical correlation.

Justification:

Add examples (e.g., drugs used during emergence).

Include complications during each phase.

Lines 58–64 (Guedel Classification)

Issue: Historical classification presented without contextualization.

Justification:

Modern anesthesia rarely follows classical ether-based stages.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Should mention that Guedel's classification is historically significant but less clinically applicable today.

Add discussion of modern monitoring replacing clinical signs.

Figure 2 (Lines 76–77)

Issue: Taken from educational website without permission.

Justification:

Copyright violation risk.

Must remove or redesign.

Neuraxial and Regional Anesthesia (Lines 81–105)

Lines 81–87

Issue: Basic explanation without depth.

Justification:

No mention of contraindications.

No complications (e.g., hypotension, PDPH).

No discussion of ultrasound guidance.

Lines 100–105

Issue: Benefits mentioned but unsupported.

Justification:

Add evidence for reduced opioid requirement.

Cite recent meta-analyses.

Clarify term “combined anesthesia” (should specify combined general–regional).

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Figure 3 (Line 98)

Issue: No source cited.

Justification:

Copyright and originality concerns.

Remove or create original illustration.

Conclusion (Lines 107-114)

Issue: Generic summary; no forward-looking statement.

Justification:

Should emphasize:

Modern advancements

Patient safety

Evidence-based anesthesia

Currently reads like textbook conclusion.

References (Lines 116-130)

Major Concerns:

Outdated References

1996, 2004 citations are old for pharmacology updates.

Textbooks Overused

Heavy reliance on textbooks rather than peer-reviewed recent articles.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Duplicate Source

Morgan & Mikhail cited twice differently.

Formatting Issues

Inconsistent punctuation.

Missing Recent Guidelines

No mention of ASA or recent clinical updates.

OVERALL JUSTIFICATION FOR MAJOR REVISION

The manuscript requires **major revision** due to:

Lack of originality and analytical depth

Over-reliance on textbook material

Outdated references

Ethical concerns regarding figures

Absence of recent advancements

Limited critical discussion

Inadequate positioning as a short communication