

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_123351
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF THE TOTAL POST-OPERATIVE RESCUE ANALGESIA BETWEEN ANALGESICS ALONE REGIMEN AND ANALGESICS-ADJUVANT ASCORBIC ACID REGIMEN IN ABAKALIKI, SOUTH-EAST NIGERIA
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>It addresses a critical aspect of post-operative pain management, particularly in resource-limited settings like Nigeria, where access to advanced analgesics may be limited. It provides evidence that incorporating intravenous ascorbic acid as an adjuvant in multimodal analgesic regimens can significantly reduce the need for rescue analgesia after caesarean sections. I appreciate the study's focus on a cost-effective and widely accessible intervention, which could have practical implications for improving patient outcomes and reducing opioid dependence. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more streamlined presentation to enhance clarity and impact.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title could have been more shorter and concise. Alternatively "Effect of Ascorbic Acid as an Adjuvant on Post-Operative Rescue Analgesia in Caesarean Section Patients: A Randomized Controlled Trial". is more concise and emphasizes the key components of the study—ascorbic acid as an adjuvant, post-operative pain management, and the randomized controlled design.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Abstract is too long. Please make it shorter, if possible within 250 words. 2) The sentence about pain management being a "dilemma to surgeons and anesthetists" is vague. Please reframe 3) Summarize the methodology more broadly, focusing on the study design and intervention, while details like sampling technique and drug dosages can be described in the full text. 4) Emphasize the potential impact of these findings on clinical practice and the recommendation for further research. 5) No need to mention Hospital place in Objective section 6) No need for repetition regarding Group detail in both study design and Methodology 7) Keywords should be in alphabetical order 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: Should be less than 250 words 2. Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion: The introduction is slightly long. Condense repetitive information and focus more on the rationale for using ascorbic acid as an adjuvant in post-operative pain management. 3. Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Add clear subsections to improve readability. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Study Design ▪ Study Population and Sample Size ▪ Randomization and Blinding ▪ Interventions (Drugs and Dosages) ▪ Pain Assessment and Outcome Measures ▪ Data Analysis ○ This will make it easier for readers to locate specific information. 4. Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Break down long tables into more manageable chunks if needed and use subsections like: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pain Scores at Different Time Points 	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Time to First Analgesic Request ▪ Rescue Analgesia Frequency ○ Consider using more visual aids (e.g., charts or graphs) to represent key data such as pain scores over time. <p>5. Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion: Divide this section into subsections to ensure a logical flow. Possible subsections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Comparison with Other Studies ○ Mechanism of Action of Ascorbic Acid ○ Clinical Implications ○ Study Limitations ○ Recommendations for Future Research <p>6. Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion: Reiterate the practical significance and emphasize the potential for future clinical trials in a more succinct manner. <p>7. References Include PMID number if applicable</p> <p>8. Ethical Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethical board clearance id number 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Study Design: The manuscript employs a randomized, double-blind controlled trial (RCT), which is considered the gold standard in clinical research for reducing bias. Randomization helps distribute potential confounding factors equally across groups, while double-blinding ensures that neither participants nor researchers are aware of group assignments, reducing the risk of bias in treatment administration and outcome assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Systematic Sampling and Sample Size: The sample size (164 participants) was determined using a validated formula for randomized controlled trials, which helps ensure sufficient statistical power. Systematic sampling reduces selection bias, and the inclusion of equal numbers in each group (82 participants per group) provides balance for comparison. <input type="checkbox"/> Use of Validated Tools: The manuscript employs widely accepted and validated tools like the Numerical Rating Scale (NRS) for pain assessment, ensuring that pain is measured reliably. The consistent use of this scale at various time points strengthens the ability to track pain intensity changes across groups. <input type="checkbox"/> Statistical Analysis: The use of SPSS version 26 for data analysis demonstrates that the study results are analyzed using appropriate statistical methods. The inclusion of P-values (e.g., $P < 0.0001$) indicates statistical significance, meaning the observed differences between the groups are not likely due to chance. Additionally, independent t-tests and chi-square tests are used, both of which are standard methods for comparing group means and proportions. <input type="checkbox"/> Relevance of Results: The conclusion that the addition of ascorbic acid reduces the need for rescue analgesia is directly supported by the data, which shows significantly lower pain scores and longer time to the first request for analgesia in the ascorbic acid group. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recent Studies on Ascorbic Acid: Some references related to the role of ascorbic acid in post-operative pain management are more than a decade old. Including newer studies or meta-analyses, particularly from the last 5 years, would strengthen the manuscript. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hung KC, et al. (2020), "The Effect of Perioperative Vitamin C on Postoperative Analgesic Consumption: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials," published in <i>Nutrients</i> (2020) could be highlighted more prominently to provide recent evidence. Manuel S, et al. (2022), "Efficacy and safety of perioperative Vitamin C in patients undergoing noncardiac surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials," from <i>Br. J. Anaesth</i> (2022) would provide updated insights. Multimodal Analgesia and Non-Opioid Approaches: More recent reviews on multimodal analgesia and non-opioid-based adjuvants could be cited to reinforce the rationale for combining ascorbic acid with other analgesics. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review article such as Shim JH. (2020), "Multimodal analgesia or balanced analgesia: the better choice?" from <i>Korean J Anesthesiol</i> could add depth to the discussion of non-opioid regimens. <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure the inclusion of more recent studies (2019–2023) on ascorbic acid's role in analgesia and multimodal pain management to reflect the latest findings. Cross-check references to ensure they are not outdated, particularly those from before 2015. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Overall, the article's language is appropriate, but minor grammatical revisions and streamlining complex sentences would make it more polished and easier to read.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Consider having the manuscript proofread or edited for language to ensure fluency and to correct minor errors before submission to a scholarly journal.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Rearrangement of sub topic/ headings should be done. Grammatical proof reading needs to be done.</p> <p>there do not appear to be any significant competing interest issues affecting this manuscript.</p> <p>IRC/IRB certification number should be mentioned.</p>	

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bikash Khadka
Department, University & Country	Nepal