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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor;

Nasotracheal Intubation-Extubation-Intubation and Asleep-Awake-Asleep Anesthesia Technique for Deep Brain Stimulation is a case report describing the anesthesia technique for Deep Brain Stimulation.

1. In the abstract: please explain the abbreviation of PD patients as Parkinson's disease.

2. The standard ASA monitors were placed: please give more details about the monitoring.

3. Both blood pressure and heart rate were significantly higher than asleep stage and the second patient needed intermittent injections of low dose nicardipine and esmolol to maintain hemodynamic stability: please give exact numbers to identify the significant difference between two stages. Please also note the dose of nicardipine and esmolol.

4. Discussion: please correct did'nt as did not

5. none of the intubation were finished during patient awake. we believe endotracheal surface anesthesia before intubation is most important whether for making patient tolerable intubation or extubation: the manuscript should be reviewed by a native English speaker.

6. All of our patients were able to wake up quickly and cooperated with neurological tests: this statement is so subjective please give exact mean time values to be more clear.

7. Did the authors perform scalp block before the procedure? Please give some information.

Kind regards

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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