

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_75088
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Prospective Study: The Analgesic Efficacy of Ultrasound-Guided Erector Spinae Plane Block versus Serratus Plane Block in Patients Undergoing Modified Radical Mastectomy</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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. USG guided blocks are work of highly skilled Anaesthesiologist. For Anaesthesiologist , training in USG guided block is always not inclusive. Here there is no mention about the person performing blocks. wheather he/she are well trained in USG guided blocks or blocks were done under supervision of senior Anaesthesiologist.</li> <li>2. there is no mention about introp monitoring of vitals, analgesics requirement. what if block has failed in any of the participant.</li> <li>3. VAS for group 1 is mostly &gt; 40. According to author, why this VAS was so high I spite of having planned rescue analgesics if VAS&gt; 40. Does it mean that post operative pain control in group 1 was poorly controlled???</li> <li>4. There is mention of reduced fentanyl dose introperatively in SABP amd ESBP than control group. How this inference were driven?? On what basis , requirement of fentanyl was judged introperatively. whaere is the introp data to support your findings.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What, according to author, is the reason for high incidence of Nausea and vomiting in group 1</li> <li>2. There is no mention of problem and difficulties while giving USG guided blocks.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. why the volume of local anaesthetic was different in EPSB group vs SPB group</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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><i>Krunal Ramteke</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Maharashtra University of health sciences, India</i></b>