

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_95219
Title of the Manuscript:	Measurement The Outcome of Low Dose of 0.5% Bupivacaine In Spinal Anesthesia During Lower Segment Cesarean Section (LSCS)
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>)

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, it is important. Nowadays, we have many people going for low dose spinal without considering other aspects like pain relief and surgical requirements. A study comparing low dose to optimum higher doses will provide information on the same. The title does not provide adequate information pertaining to the type of study (comparative). Also, it should mention Bupivacaine as "Heavy or in Dextrose" to avoid confusion. Title Suggestion: "Comparing the outcome of low dose 0.5% heavy bupivacaine with higher optimum dose in spinal anaesthesia for Lower segment Caesarean section." Abstract is comprehensive. However, instead of large dose written in conclusion – use term like optimum or optimum higher dose as large dose is also detrimental. Mention the inclusion and exclusion criteria after objectives. Mention the height, weight of patients and if they had any change in dose or result of the dose of spinal drug given. Yes Yes, if possible, find alternative for the 1993 and 1989 articles (Ref no 9 and 14) Additional Reference: https://www.saudija.org/article.asp?issn=1658-354X;year=2019;volume=13;issue=3;spage=208;epage=214;aulast=Cenkowski Kindly mention preloading volume in ml/kg. Instead of 20-30seconds- kindly mention the speed of spinal drug administration in ml/s. Instead of sympathectomy, use the word reduced sympathetic drive or reduced sympathetic response. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Few errors in English language and grammar present, necessary corrections have been highlighted. Define low dose spinal. How much was the duration of anaesthesia in both groups? How was the recovery time? 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pratika Bhokare
Department, University & Country	Jupiter Hospital, India