

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>)

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	<p>The manuscript entitled " Ultrasound Guided Erector Spinae Plane Block Versus Ultrasound Guided Thoracic Paravertebral Block for Pain Relief in Patients with Multiple Fractured Ribs" is interesting but major revision should be done. First of all the manuscript needs English editing. There are so many grammar errors that should be corrected.</p> <p>The Ethical approval for the manuscript is missing.</p> <p>In the abstract the clear aim of study should be emphasised. In the method part the all methods used in the study is missing. The conclusion is too general "nearly effective". Please be more precise.</p> <p>It will be wort to include the third and fourth group of the patients with rib fracture who received intravenous analgesia or epidural and compare to other groups.</p> <p>The techniques of regional analgesia is missing. Please describe the techniques.</p> <p>Please answer why all patients received 1 g of paracetamol every 8 h.</p> <p>In the section Patents and methods the clear allocation of the patients to the groups should be highlighted.</p> <p>In the section Result please provide how the results were presented (average, mean). It would be worth to show the deviation or 25th-75th percentile.</p> <p>When using abbreviations, please writhe the full name (tables, figures).</p> <p>The conclusion is too general and the number of the patients small.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vlatka Sotosek
Department, University & Country	University of Rijeka, Croatia