

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_95046
Title of the Manuscript:	Ultrasound-Guided Transmuscular versus Anterior Subcostal Quadratus Lumborum Blocks versus Thoracic Paravertebral Block for Acute Postoperative Pain Management in Open Renal Surgeries
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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Yes The abstract – I suggest shorten the introduction(background). Elaborate more on the results for example the HR & MAP was not mentioned but was elaborate in the results. The complications should be mentioned if permit No Yes Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Methods To elaborate on primary outcome (time for VAS assessment should be clear in the methods _ eg 4,8,12 etc...) The HR & MAP should be describe properly in the methods too. Standardised the term of Group I, Group II & Group III, some were written as group I, group II & group III. Results Suggest to move the flow chart to the methods.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Azarinah Izaham
Department, University & Country	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia