

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_85095
Title of the Manuscript:	A PROSPECTIVE STUDY COMPARING 0.25% BUPIVACAINE AND 0.375% ROPIVACAINE IN TRANSVERSUS ABDOMINIS PLANE BLOCK FOR POSTOPERATIVE ANALGESIA IN LAPAROSCOPIC ABDOMINAL SURGERY.
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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	<p>Review Comments</p> <p>Reviewer's comment: 1. The design of the study is decent. It is a good study. Based on the methods described, it is a double blinded randomized study. The authors should make it clear in the Materials and Methods section</p> <p>2. It's generally recommended to do the regional analgesia block under light sedation, not general anesthesia.</p> <p>3. Is it better to have the regional anesthesia done in preop? It might be more beneficial to patients. This topic is debatable.</p> <p>4. The statement that "bupivacaine carries the risk of cardiotoxicity" is not totally true. If ropivacaine is injected into the iv, it could kill patients as easily as bupivacaine. Ropivacaine is "less cardiotoxic", most likely is related to its low potency. As this study showed, both of them should be compared under equipotent dose.</p> <p>5. There are several grammar issues in the manuscript. Please correct them. For example, in the Introduction, "the benefit-----include---" is not correct based on English grammar. The pronoun and verb should agree with each other.</p> <p>PART 2:</p> <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? None</p> <p>Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript? None</p> <p>PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the reviewer: "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"</p> <p>PART 4: Objective Evaluation:</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:	Joe Liu
Department, University & Country	MSU, USA