

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_94867
Title of the Manuscript:	"A comparison of the effect on postoperative pain between lateral femoral cutaneous nerve block and local infiltration anesthesia after total hip arthroplasty: a randomized trial."
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>abstract, title and references; The title is informative, properly written and the study design is related to the title. The abstract is structured and properly written. The aim of the study is clear; the results are clear and study results answer the research questions. References are relevant, appropriate studies were included and referenced correctly.</p> <p>Introduction; clearly outlined and justified. The research question is properly outlined and related to what is already known.</p> <p>Methods; The study design is clear, suitable to research question, reproducible, the subject selection is clear, methods are valid and reliable, variables defined clearly and statistical methods are reasonable. But why All patients received bolus administration of 250 µg fentanyl before skin closure ?? It was a high dose narcotics & there is nerve block or local infiltration wase done.</p> <p>Results; Regarding results, data were properly presented. Tables labelled correctly. Results section is explanatory, clear, provides what is statistically significant and practically meaningful. Tables abbreviation should be written under each table.</p> <p>Discussion; The discussion section written appropriately, clearly and results discussed without over interpretation of results. Discussion answers the research question and provided by supporting references.</p> <p>Overall; Overall, the study design is proper, title is clear, comprehensive, short and informative. Abstract is properly written. The introduction is appropriate, aim is clear, methods were properly written, answers the study question and reproducible. Results presented in a good way, . The discussion included relevant studies, and provided by supporting references</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ibrahim Fadi Mahmoud
Department, University & Country	Al-Azher University, Egypt