



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_29234
Title of the Manuscript:	The Efficacy of the Volume of Hyperbaric Bupivacaine Used and Its Influence on Spinal Anaesthesia Induced Hypotension During Caesarean Section
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	ABSTRACT: Mention the inclusion and exclusion criteria INTRODUCTION: No changes METHODS: Mention whether ethics approval was obtained or not. Explain why height was used as measure to determine the amount of bupivacaine to be used when it is not a standardised measure and why it was measured only for 88 subjects. Please mention the number of patients screened and excluded. RESULTS: Mention the r value for the correlation analysis. No statistical tests have been done to determine whether the difference seen between the 3 groups (<2 mls, 2 mls and >2 mls) was statistically significant or not. DISCUSSION: No changes CONCLUSION: No changes Ethical issue: Please mention whether ethics approval was obtained or not	Being an audit and observational study, I did not think it was necessary for the study protocol to be reviewed by ethical committee so it was not done. However a written informed consent was obtained from all participants before anaesthesia and surgery Height was used to determine the volume of bupivacaine used was based on the experience of the anaesthetist though departmental practice. The detail is explained in the write up. The number of patients excluded based on exclusion criteria were not taken not of. I think this was an oversight. The r value of the correlation has been mentioned The statistical tests have been done for the Groups and the findings is included in the write up
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study does not add anything new to the field.	