

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_95046</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Ultrasound-Guided Transmuscular versus Anterior Subcostal Quadratus Lumborum Blocks versus Thoracic Paravertebral Block for Acute Postoperative Pain Management in Open Renal Surgeries</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, it is important.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, but it can be more specific like</b> Ultrasound-Guided Transmuscular and Thoracic Paravertebral Block, but not Anterior Subcostal Quadratus Lumborum Block, are effective for Acute Postoperative Pain Management in Open Renal Surgeries <b>Yes , they are appropriate.</b></p> <p><b>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p><b>The references are sufficient and recent.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language is suitable but needs correction for some typing errors.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is interesting and well written but needs some correction in order to improve its quality.</p> <p>First of all, when mention for the first time all abbreviations should be written in full name.</p> <p>The abstract should be rewritten, predominantly the method part that should be fulfilled with information about what was analyzed and how. Additionally, according to methods please highlight the main results in the section Results of the abstract.</p> <p>In the Introduction part the sentence Nowadays, all generations (children, pregnant women, and adults) having abdominal surgery get the QL block as one of the perioperative pain control techniques should be rewritten because not all patients and generation get QL block for analgesia. Please in the section Methods please for all drug and devices used in the study provide manufacturer, city and state. For drug please provide the dosage. Explain VAS score and describe the situation when the VAS was recorded (in rest, at movement, during coughing) . Please be more specific about time paints. Please writhe how the randomization was done.</p> <p>Omit symbols like &amp;. For abbreviations like HR, MAP provide full name when the first time mentioned. Please omit Table 1, table 2, Table 3 before the tables (There was no significant difference between the three groups as regards demographic data. <del>Table 4</del></p> <p>In Table 2 the unites are missing and labeled for pulse.</p> <p>For all results please proved how are presented - median, mean, percentile.</p> <p>How was the satisfaction of the patients analyzed? Please prove questionnaires you used in the study and display the results.</p> <p>For figure 2 proved the labels for x and y axes and proved how the results are showed (median, mean, SD). Please proved the limitation of the study.</p> <p>There are some references that should be rewritten according to the instructions.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Vlatka Sotosek</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Rijeka, Croatia</b>