

Review report

BSMMUJ-17.4 – 76147

Effectiveness of laser tonsillectomy compared to conventional cold steel tonsillectomy in children

Raouf MQM *et al.* (iadam9492@gmail.com)

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
Date of submission: 12-Sep-24	
A. Technical review	
ROUND 1	
Reviewer's name: Helal Uddin Ahmed	
ORCID: 0000-0003-4106-218X	
Date assigned: 16-Oct-24	
Date submitted: 17-Oct-24	
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? No	
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? Yes	
Comments sent to author (Date: 21-Oct-24)	Date: 22-Oct-24
2. Is the title appropriate? = No 2a. This title does not tell us the objective of the study whether it likes to show efficacy or side effects also it doesn't tell us the nature of the study (cross-sectional/interventional) The title should be 'Outcome of laser tonsillectomy in comparison to conventional tonsillectomy in children'.	Interventional has been written in both abstract and methods. The title changed to 'Outcome of laser tonsillectomy in comparison to conventional cold steel tonsillectomy in children'.
3. Does the abstract provide a complete and accurate description of the content of the article? = No 3a. Background is not clearly stated in lines 30-32. In lines: 30-32: The rationale for doing the current research is not clearly stated. Methods: The author needs to describe the sample size more numerically, and avoid non-specific terms like "almost". (Line 32-33). Please avoid any subheading in this section. Result: Please start the result with a line denoting sociodemography or baseline information. the results can be re-written to clarify the measures of Group A and Group B. Line 40 should clarify whether it is "blood or "Blood loss" Conclusion: Please re-write the conclusion in a more meaningful way.	The rationale for doing the current research has been clearly stated in the introduction section. The term "almost" was omitted and replaced by numbers in both the abstract and methods sections. Scio-demographics and "Blood loss" were written in the results section. The conclusion of the abstract has been rewritten.
6. Are the methods described in sufficient detail so that the study could be reproduced? = No 6a. Study place not properly mentioned. Sample size determination was not mentioned and sampling technique was also not mentioned.	The study place, the sample size and the sampling technique have been mentioned in the method section
10. Is the Discussion section critical and comprehensive about the main message of the manuscript? = No 10a. Line 196-217 can be omitted.	The Discussion section has been re-written and the lines 196-217 have been omitted.
12. Are the conclusions drawn supported by the results/ data? = No 12a. Lines 300-301 can be omitted as this is not the objective of the study.	The lines 300-301 have been omitted and the conclusion has been rewritten.
13. Are the references appropriate in number and up to date? = No 13a. Too many old references (more than half are older than 10 years back)	The old references have been replaced with updated references.
17. Is the standard of English acceptable for publication? = No 17a. Needs re-write to correct some grammatical mistakes, and to make the sentences more understandable.	The English language has been corrected.

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
Reviewer's recommendation: Revisions Required	
Reviewer's name: Nasima Akhtar	
ORCID: 0009-0009-2345-5001	
Date assigned: 19-Oct-24	
Date submitted: 19-Oct-24	
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? No	
Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? Yes	
<p>2. Is the title appropriate? = No</p> <p>2a. The study investigates the efficacy of two techniques of tonsillectomy-CO2 laser and cold steel dissection in the paediatric population, but the title could not focus it at a glance.</p> <p>The title should be Outcome of laser tonsillectomy in comparison to conventional cold dissection in the paediatric population.</p>	<p>The title changed to 'Outcome of laser tonsillectomy in comparison to conventional cold steel tonsillectomy in children'.</p>
<p>3. Does the abstract provide a complete and accurate description of the content of the article? = No</p> <p>3a. Background: the opening sentence is somewhat unclear in lines 30-32.</p> <p>The rationale for this work is unclear.</p> <p>Method: The sample size should be numerical.</p> <p>Mentioning the duration of the study could also enhance the context.</p> <p>Please avoid the subheading in line 36.</p> <p>Result: Please summarise the key findings sequentially, focusing on the most significant outcome to enhance clarity.</p>	<p>The Background has been revised to make it clear.</p> <p>The rationale for doing the current research has been clearly stated in the introduction section.</p> <p>The sample size has been rewritten in both the abstract and method sections.</p> <p>The duration of the study was mentioned in the method section.</p> <p>The subheading of the line 36 has been avoided.</p> <p>The result section has been summarized accordingly.</p>
<p>6. Are the methods described in sufficient detail so that the study could be reproduced? = No</p> <p>6a. Duration of study and place of study are not mentioned properly.</p>	<p>The duration of study and place of study has been mentioned</p>
<p>10. Is the Discussion section critical and comprehensive about the main message of the manuscript? = No</p> <p>10a. Lines 196-97 can be omitted.</p> <p>Line 2218 to 220 and 232 to 234 using repetition of sentence.</p>	<p>The mentioned lines have been omitted.</p>
<p>12. Are the conclusions drawn supported by the results/ data? = No</p> <p>12a. The lines 299 & 300 should be omitted as this is not the objective of the study.</p>	<p>The mentioned lines have been omitted.</p>
<p>13. Are the references appropriate in number and up to date? = No</p> <p>13a. Too many older references- ref no: 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19.</p>	<p>The old references have been replaced with updated references.</p>
<p>17. Is the standard of English acceptable for publication? = No</p> <p>17a. Needs to revise the lines 275, 284, 288, 289.</p>	<p>The English language has been corrected and the mentioned lines have been revised.</p>
Reviewer's recommendation: Revisions Required	
Editor's comments	
Editor's name: M Mostafa Zaman	
ORCID: 0000-0002-1736-1342	
<p>1. Abstract: Lines 34: The sentence "an informative and balanced summary" is not necessary. It might have been copied from somewhere. Present results up to one decimal point. This is not an observational but an interventional study.</p>	<p>The sentence "an informative and balanced summary" has been omitted, and an interventional study has been written.</p>

REVIEW COMMENTS	AUTHOR RESPONSE
<p>2. Methods: As mentioned above, this is an interventional study; drop "observational comparative".</p> <p>Line 118: Drop the heading of "Quantitative variables" and add "Ascertainment of variables".</p> <p>Lines 161-162: Bias and sample size are given in small bullets. Describe bias in detail. Sample size can be a part of the paragraph for the participants (lines 106-114).</p>	<p>The sentence "observational comparative" was dropped. The heading "Quantitative variables" was omitted, and "Ascertainment of variables" was replaced</p> <p>The heading of "Quantitative variables" was omitted, and "Ascertainment of variables" was replaced.</p> <p>The sentence Bias was omitted and the sample size was added.</p>
<p>3. Statistical analysis should include the names of the tests used for each variable.</p>	<p>Statistical analysis has been revised accordingly.</p>
<p>4. Results: Avoid subheadings for participants, descriptive data and outcome data. Just describe them in the form of storytelling. Limit the results up to one decimal point.</p>	<p>The results have been revised accordingly.</p>
<p>5. Discussion: Drop the heading of interpretation. Make the Discussion shorter keeping the main message only. Avoid orphan single-sentence paragraphs (e.g., lines 237-238). Merge the generalizability and limitation together. Do not use any subheading.</p>	<p>The discussion section has been changed</p>
<p>6. Table 1: Present results as n (%), avoid using two lines for these data. These could be given in one line.</p> <p>Table 2: Keep results up to one decimal point.</p> <p>Tables 3-5: Merge them to form a single table on the post-operative findings (If you follow the suggestion for Table 1, you shall be able to reduce line liners by 50%). Results should be given up to one decimal point.</p>	<p>Table 1 has been corrected.</p> <p>Tables 3-5 were merged into one table, and the results have been given up to one decimal point</p>
<p>7. Finally, I suggest you have a language check, and reduce the length of the manuscript to <2000 words by reducing the length of the Introduction and Discussion sections.</p>	<p>The English language was checked and the text word number apart from the abstract, tables and references became 1984 words by reducing the length of the Introduction and Discussion sections.</p>
<p>Editor's decision: Revision Required</p>	

<p>B. Editorial decision</p>	<p>Date: 22-Oct-24</p>
<p>Final decision: Accepted subject to editorial clarifications.</p>	