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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

What is the main focus of the manuscript? What is the rationale of the opinion paper?
What are the areas of feature studies you will suggest following your opinion? What is the impact of this publication to clinical practice?
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Dear Authors, evaluate the current role of nitrous oxide in paediatric anaesthesia is a good purpose. However, the paper in the current version has some major weaknesses.

Some suggestions:

1. In the Introduction, the authors stated their objective is to discuss the present status of nitrous oxide in paediatric anaesthesia practice. However, the paper details the pharmacological characteristics of nitrous oxide but does not provide data on its current role in contemporary pediatric anaesthesia.

2. Methods are missing: selection criteria and critical analysis of literature research are not described

3. In the paragraph, Do we have a better alternative the author’s state: “However, none of these has the beneficial property of amnesia analgesia of the degree offered by Nitrous oxide with comparable cardiovascular

The current data has been discussed in a detailed way now.

Methods of selection and critical analysis have been added now.

Reference citation has been added.
4. Are there any studies comparing the degree of amnesia or analgesia or cardiovascular stability between BDZ, opioids, alpha2 agonists to nitrous oxide?

We have added the studies on opioid, benzodiazepine and ketamine as compared to nitrous oxide in children. We could not find any study on its comparison to alpha2 agonists.

5. Discussion is missing- The bibliography is dated, I believe that this data needs to be commented on;

Discussion has been added.

6. The Conclusion is non-specific, it must be rephrased after writing the Discussion.

Conclusion has been rephrased now.

7. Minor requests:- The paragraph Metabolic effects is quite long and very detailed, it should be shortened.

The paragraph on metabolic effects has been shortened.


The composition of Entonox has been specified.