

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 86228

Title: Effects of combined spinal-epidural anesthesia on anxiety, labor analgesia and motor blocks in women during natural delivery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746387

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-22 21:43

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-02 08:57

Review time: 10 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors used random number table approach to explore the effects of combined spinal-epidural anesthesia on anxiety, labor analgesia and motor block in women with natural delivery. After reasonable setting groups for women with natural delivery as joint and control groups, the authors showed that combined spinal-epidural anesthesia can reduce anxiety, labor analgesia, shorten labor time, and reduce postoperative stress level, but has little effect on motor block. This result also draws a conclusion that the combined spinal-epidural anesthesia is a promising anesthetization for women with natural delivery. In short, the topic of this manuscript is timely and interesting. The authors have organized the manuscript rationally, with good methodology and well-written English. However, some important editing needs to be done before publication: 1. In this study, the authors compared the key factors of parturients underwent epidural anesthesia and combined spinal-epidural anesthesia. I wonder what is the most commonly used anesthetization for women with natural delivery in clinical? What is the key advantage of combined spinal-epidural anesthesia compared with the most commonly used one? 2. In Figure2, there is a Chinese annotation, which should be



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

changed.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 86228

Title: Effects of combined spinal-epidural anesthesia on anxiety, labor analgesia and motor blocks in women during natural delivery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746775

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-23 22:23

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-02 09:32

Review time: 9 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Recently, combined spinal-epidural anesthesia is widely used to relieve the pain of parturients in natural childbirth, which still receive a lot of controversy in clinical. To address this challenge, in this study, the authors aimed at investigating the therapeutic effects of combined spinal-epidural anesthesia on anxiety, labor analgesia and motor block in parturients with natural delivery. The authors used clinical data, observation methods and statistical analysis to verify their hypothesis. The results showed that compared to epidural anesthesia, combined spinal-epidural anesthesia can significantly influence the VAS scores for the first, second, and third stages, the rate of transfer caesarean section and postpartum blood loss, as well as nitric oxide (NO), cortisol (Cor), and adrenaline (ADR) levels of parturients. So, in my opinion, this paper is well-written. The experimental design is reasonable, and the results reflects the conclusion as well. I recommend its acceptance after the minor revision. The detailed comments are: Comments 1, I noticed that the authors used clinical data between October 2016 and December 2017, rather than the latest data. What is the reason for this design? comments 2, Several typo and grammar issues should be addressed. For example, in sentence "The

rate of transfer caesarean section and postpartum blood loss in the joint group were lesser when compared to the control group ($P<0.05$).” lesser should be less.