

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3154
Title of the Manuscript:	Anesthesia and Pulmonary Hypertension: A Narrative Review
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Pulmonary hypertension is a common condition and these patients are frequently encountered in the surgical disciplines requiring more complex anaesthetic techniques. It is an important contribution to the scientific community aiding physicians in better understanding how to evaluate and manage this condition during anaesthesia.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is overall scientifically correct and robust.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is of good scholarly quality.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have one objection in regard to the TAPSE/sPAP normal value and when it is considered as worsening. The author quotes the normal value as < 0.19. I believe this should be reviewed by the author as I have 0.8 – 1 as the normal value. Furthermore the author then comments in the following sentence that as the value increases it means a worse prognosis when the opposite is in my view true. This is in the sub section of pre operative evaluation. 2. Table 5 rhythm is misspelled 3. The word clinic needs to be removed in this sentence: "However,currentPH guidelines and experts recommend regional anesthesia(RA) in eligible patients for elective surgeries, as positivepressure ventilation (PPV) with high positive end-expiratorypressure (PEEP) and tidal volume may worsen RV afterloadand, thus, PH clinic." 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Recommend publish after above considerations</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Arthur Elder Mc Kinnon</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Rob Ferreira Tertiary Hospital, South Africa</p>