Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Volume 13 · Issue 6 · e142921

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Relationship Between Airway Examination with LEMON Criteria and Difficulty of Tracheal Intubation with IDS Criteria

Pooya Derakhshan, Nasim Nikoubakht, Mahzad Alimian, Sadaf Mohammadi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
8 Nov 2023	13 Dec 2023	17 Dec 2023	10.5812/aapm-142921

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4

Authors' reply to reviewers 5

Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

4 comments · 21 Nov 2023 – 27 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 21 Nov 2023

Dear Associate editor,
Thanks for the invitation.
The study exploring the relationship between the LEMON score and IDS criteria in predicting difficulty during tracheal intubation presents several strengths, including a focused objective, a systematic methodological approach, and clinically relevant findings. It highlights the importance of limited neck mobility as a predictor for difficult intubation, aligning with previous research.

However, the novelty of the study might be limited due to its alignment with existing literature that also supports the predictive ability of the LEMON score and the significance of certain parameters, such as limited neck mobility, in assessing intubation difficulty. The study's focus on operating room patients and its cross-sectional design might also restrict its novelty and generalizability to broader medical settings.

Although the study contributes valuable insights to the existing body of knowledge, its contribution in terms of novelty might be moderate compared to highly groundbreaking or pioneering research in the field. Depending on the journal's standards and the depth of the existing literature, the study could still merit publication for its systematic approach, clinically relevant findings, and alignment with established research.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 25 Nov 2023

Dear AE,

Patient Selection and Exclusion Criteria: The exclusion of patients with specific conditions (like ASA class higher than 3, emergency intubation, etc.) may limit the applicability of the study results to a broader patient population. There's a lack of justification for these exclusion criteria.

Scoring System Application: The application of the LEMON and IDS criteria should be more detailed, especially regarding how these scores were calculated and by whom. This information is crucial for assessing the reliability of the scoring process.

Data Analysis and Interpretation
Statistical Analysis: The statistical methods used for data analysis seem to be basic and might not adequately address the complexity of the data. More advanced statistical techniques could provide deeper insights.

Presentation and Structure
Clarity and Organization: The manuscript could benefit from better organization and clarity, especially in the methods and results sections. Some parts are overly technical and might be difficult for a general medical audience to follow.

Typographical and Grammatical Errors: There are several typographical and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript, which detract from its overall professionalism and readability.

Limitations
Acknowledgment of Limitations: While the study acknowledges its limitations, it could further elaborate on how these limitations impact the study's findings and implications. For example, the cross-sectional design limits the ability to establish causality.

The study provides valuable insights into the relationship between LEMON criteria and IDS in predicting difficult intubation. However, addressing the above concerns, particularly in methodology and data analysis, would significantly enhance the manuscript's scientific rigor and potential impact on clinical practice.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 27 Nov 2023

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors and appreciation to the researchers. The manuscript presents valuable research. However, some revisions are needed as requested by the reviewers. A minor change should also be made in the abstract:
A summary of the statistical analysis results should be mentioned in the results section of the ABSTRACT.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 27 Nov 2023

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting the article. It needs some revision. Please revise it based on the reviewers' and AE's comments.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response to reviewers:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Associate editor,
Thanks for the invitation.
The study exploring the relationship between the LEMON score and IDS criteria in predicting difficulty during tracheal intubation presents several strengths, including a focused objective, a systematic methodological approach, and clinically relevant findings. It highlights the importance of limited neck mobility as a predictor for difficult intubation, aligning with previous research.

However, the novelty of the study might be limited due to its alignment with existing literature that also supports the predictive ability of the LEMON score and the significance of certain parameters, such as limited neck mobility, in assessing intubation difficulty. The study's focus on operating room patients and its cross-sectional design might also restrict its novelty and generalizability to broader medical settings.

Although the study contributes valuable insights to the existing body of knowledge, its contribution in terms of novelty might be moderate compared to highly groundbreaking or pioneering research in the field. Depending on the journal's standards and the depth of the existing literature, the study could still merit publication for its systematic approach, clinically relevant findings, and alignment with established research.

Thanks for your valuable comments
Reviewer 2:
Dear AE,

Patient Selection and Exclusion Criteria: The exclusion of patients with specific conditions (like ASA class higher than 3, emergency intubation, etc.) may limit the applicability of the study results to a broader patient population. There's a lack of justification for these exclusion criteria.

The reason for excluding this group of patients was due to ethical considerations and trying not to create risk for this group of patients due to the same anesthesia induction drugs in this study, while emergency patients or patients with severe underlying diseases may need a different anesthesia induction method and airway management.

Scoring System Application: The application of the LEMON and IDS criteria should be more detailed, especially regarding how these scores were calculated and by whom. This information is crucial for assessing the reliability of the scoring process.

The scoring of these two methods (LEMON and IDS) was not prepared by the researchers of this study, but both of these scales are given in similar

studies and numerous books that are also mentioned in this study. The way to explain them (LEMON and IDS) in this study is given from the same studies.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Statistical Analysis: The statistical methods used for data analysis seem to be basic and might not adequately address the complexity of the data. More advanced statistical techniques could provide deeper insights.

Regarding the way of data analysis in this study, we used statisticians, and the data analysis was done by an experienced statistician.

Presentation and Structure

Clarity and Organization: The manuscript could benefit from better organization and clarity, especially in the methods and results sections. Some parts are overly technical and might be difficult for a general medical audience to follow.

Agree and done

Typographical and Grammatical Errors: There are several typographical and grammatical errors throughout the manuscript, which detract from its overall professionalism and readability.

Agree and done.

Limitations

Acknowledgment of Limitations: While the study acknowledges its limitations, it could further elaborate on how these limitations impact the study's findings and implications. For example, the cross-sectional design limits the ability to establish causality.

Agree and done

The study provides valuable insights into the relationship between LEMON criteria and IDS in predicting difficult intubation. However, addressing the above concerns, particularly in methodology and data analysis, would significantly enhance the manuscript's scientific rigor and potential impact on clinical practice.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear EIC,

Thanks to the authors and appreciation to the researchers. The manuscript is a valuable research. But some revisions are needed as requested by reviewers. also minor change should be don in abstract:

Summary of Statistical analysis results should be mention in result section of ABSTRACT.

Thanks for your valuable comments.

Agree and done

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 17 Dec 2023 – 17 Dec 2023

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 17 Dec 2023

Dear AE,
I reviewed the manuscript again. The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated.
The authors have addressed all comments.
Thank you

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 17 Dec 2023

Dear EIC.
Previous errors have been corrected, and there are no further recommendations.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 17 Dec 2023

Dear Author,
Thank you for your explanation, and I find your manuscript acceptable.