

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_103079
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical Investigation of Combining an Intravenous Injection of Parecoxib Sodium, a Single-Bolus Epidural Injection of Morphine, and Intravenous Analgesia With Dezocine in Puerperae Undergoing a Cesarean Section
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Multimodal postoperative analgesia is a method of interest and combining regional and parenteral analgesic methods are trending. The manuscript is randomized but it is not double blinded so bias on the results may be present.</p> <p>2. The title is long and misleading. I suggest “Parecoxib, Dezocine and Epidural Morphine for Perioperative Multimodal Analgesia in Cesarean Section: A Randomized Study”</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, however all significant results should be present in the abstract such as number of breastfeeding. The abstract is also longer than usual. (455 words)</p> <p>4. The structure and subsections of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5. There are problems with statistical methods. Repeated measures analysis of variance should be used in multiple measurements of pain and substance p such as in tables 2, 3 and 6 instead of one-way analysis of variance. Is a power analysis performed? How were the sample sizes determined. Are P values corrected for post-hoc analysis? Who measured the pain scores? (Nurses? Doctors? were they blinded to the study??) The conclusion <i>“The single intravenous sodium parecoxib promote maternal postoperative off-bed activity and breast-feed to newborn”</i> cannot be an outcome since in the results of the abstract it is stated that <i>“There was no statistically significant difference in the time to start breastfeeding after surgery”</i> Why wasn't the epidural catheter used for postoperative analgesia? When was it removed? How much of the dezocine solution in the IV PCA used? . How many boluses were demanded and how many were delivered? What was the total dezocine dose administered to the patients in the first postoperative 48 hours? Wouldn't it would be better to administer PCA with an electronic pump? Postoperative oxytocin infusion may interfere with pain scores. When was oxytocin infusion stopped postoperatively. Was the dose standardized for the study? Was there any difference in oxytocin doses in the study groups?</p> <p>Page 19 line 6 “a domestic study” domestic should be removed.</p> <p>7. The references are sufficient and up to date.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are numerous language errors. Language editing by a native speaker is recommended.</p> <p>Mean ± standard deviation should be abbreviated as (X ±SD)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mehmet Alper Salman
Department, University & Country	Lösante Children's and Adult Hospital, Türkiye