

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55314

**Title:** ANAESTHESIA FOR INTERVENTIONAL RADIOLOGICAL PROCEDURES: A REVIEW ARTICLE

### Recommendation:

- Accept as it is .....
- ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision .....
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

| Rating         | Excel. | Good | Fair | Poor |
|----------------|--------|------|------|------|
| Originality    |        | ✓    |      |      |
| Techn. Quality |        | ✓    |      |      |
| Clarity        |        | ✓    |      |      |
| Significance   | ✓      |      |      |      |

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

**Date:** 19.12.25

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

#### Strengths of the Paper

- **Clear and Comprehensive Scope** The paper provides an extensive overview of anesthetic considerations in interventional radiology (IR), covering a broad range of topics including procedural techniques, patient management, and future developments.
- **Inclusion of Current and Future Perspectives** The article thoughtfully incorporates recent technological advancements and emerging trends such as AI integration, robotic assistance, and fusion imaging, making it highly relevant in the evolving field of IR.
- **Structured Content and Informative Tables** The paper is well organized, with clear headings, and includes tabulated summaries of procedures, complications, and anesthetic considerations, aiding readability and understanding.
- **Wide Range of References** The extensive reference list from diverse, reputable sources enhances the credibility and depth of the review.

#### Weaknesses of the Paper

- **Lack of Ethical Clearance Statement** The paper does not mention whether ethical approval was necessary or obtained, which is relevant even for reviews, especially if patient data or specific cases are discussed.
- **Methodology Not Explicitly Described** As a review article, detailed information regarding the literature search strategy, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and data synthesis methods is missing, which diminishes transparency and reproducibility.
- **Minimal Discussion on Patient Outcomes and Comparative Data** Although it discusses techniques and challenges, there is limited emphasis on actual patient outcomes, complication rates, or comparative effectiveness of different anesthetic strategies.
- **Limited Critical Analysis of Emerging Technologies** While future directions are mentioned, there is a paucity of critical appraisal regarding the feasibility, limitations, and practical implementation of those innovations.
- **Inconsistencies in Referencing Style** Numbered references are used, but some citations lack consistent formatting, which affects professionalism.
- **Occasional Typographical and Grammatical Errors** Minor typographical mistakes and awkward phrasing are present, which could affect readability.
- **Vague Objective and Conclusion Statements** The objectives are broad but not explicitly stated in a defined section; conclusions summarize content but lack strong, specific take-home messages.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### Reviewer Comments

- **Ethical Clearance:** As a review article, the need for ethical approval is generally not obligatory unless patient data or case specifics are presented. The manuscript does not mention whether ethical clearance was necessary or obtained, which would be pertinent if individual patient information was included.
- **Methodology:** The article lacks detailed description of the literature search strategy, inclusion criteria, and data synthesis methods, crucial for assessing the review's comprehensiveness and bias.
- **Typographical and Language Quality:** Minor typographical errors are present. Overall, the language is clear, but some sentences could benefit from polishing for conciseness and clarity.
- **Formatting:** References are numbered and listed extensively but could benefit from uniformity in citation style. The layout is generally acceptable but could be improved with consistent heading styles and spacing.
- **Clarity of Objectives, Results, and Conclusion:** The objectives are broadly stated as providing an overview of anesthetic considerations. The results are mainly descriptive, and the conclusion effectively emphasizes the importance of anesthetic management in IR but could be more precise regarding key take-home messages.
- **Adequacy of References:** The references include a good mix of recent and foundational literature, supporting the review's content. However, some references appear outdated, and the inclusion of recent advances could be expanded.
- **Missing or Incomplete Information:** A more detailed description of the search methodology, inclusion criteria, and a critical analysis of the evidence supporting various practices would enhance the manuscript. Additionally, specific patient outcome data or comparative analysis of anesthetic techniques are lacking.