

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_82944
Title of the Manuscript:	Ultrasound Guided Erector Spinae Plane Block Versus Ultrasound Guided Thoracic Paravertebral Block for Pain Relief in Patients with Multiple Fractured Ribs
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>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall, the article contains many grammatical mistakes. Few sentences are incomplete, or sentences are combined without much meaning. Use of punctuations needs a re-look. 2. Title. Identify that this is a randomised study in the title itself. 3. Abstract. Grammatical corrections are required. 4. Introduction. Sentences rephrasing is required. And punctuation mark corrections. 5. Methods. Details of how the blocks were conducted and ultrasound machine/ probes used can be added. How long after admission were the blocks given? 6. Statistical analysis. General information on how a statistical test method maybe used is written. Please mention which test was used to compare which specific dataset. 7. Results. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Chest tube is mentioned in associated injury, which perhaps must have been an intervention performed during ICU stay. (b) Flail segment is written twice in Table 1. (c) Chi square test is used to compare the groups in table 1. Student t-test may be more appropriate. Same for FE test. (d) Although the difference between groups is insignificant in terms of MAP, HR, RR, oxygen saturation and the PF ratio, the patients with contusion, haemothorax and pneumothorax may have led to an underlying lung pathology. These pathologies will not improve only due to the analgesic technique. VAS scores may have reduced due to the blocks. To conclude that P/F ratio, oxygen saturations improved after the blocks may be inappropriate. Karmarkar et al reported improvement in these parameters in patients with only rib fractures, (e) The pathologies are assumed to be due to the injury or rib fracture induced. Were these pathologies only on side of rib fractures? (f) Table 2 mentions respiratory rate of 2 and 1 at 1 hour and 2 hours respectively in group I. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ethical approval may be added after 'Competing Interest Disclaimer' or may be added in text. 2. Reference numbers are written in superscript. Same may be corrected as per journal instructions. 3. Few references are cited incorrectly. Journal name abbreviations need to be written and in few references volume and issue are not mentioned. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CONSORT checklist may be followed to write the article for corrections. 	

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:	Abdul Nasser
Department, University & Country	INHS Asvini, India