

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Anesthesiology

Ms: 2680

Title: THE COMPARISON OF LOW DOSE HYPERBARIC BUPIVACAINE AND LEVOBUPIVACAINE IN UNILATERAL SPINAL ANESTHESIA FOR AMBULATORY KNEE ARTHROSCOPY

Reviewer code: 00338315

Science editor: x.x.song@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-03-07 15:21

Date reviewed: 2013-03-17 13:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

No

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

. Patients and methods: The consort flow diagram is missing. Exclusion and inclusion criteria are not well defined. What about patients who developed bilateral block , Is there any one? How do you manage shivering? Statistical analysis: The assumptions used for the sample size calculations need to be referenced. Please also define your primary outcome. What is the aim of post-analysis power calculation ? Discussion: The discussion section was long and included data that have been mentioned else where in the manuscript so it should be rewritten. The discussion section should include an abstract about other limitations than density including number of surgeons and degree of experience, incidence of bilateral block.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Anesthesiology

Ms: 2680

Title: THE COMPARISON OF LOW DOSE HYPERBARIC BUPIVACAINE AND LEVOBUPIVACAINE IN UNILATERAL SPINAL ANESTHESIA FOR AMBULATORY KNEE ARTHROSCOPY

Reviewer code: 00529915

Science editor: x.x.song@wjgnet.com

Date sent for review: 2013-03-07 15:21

Date reviewed: 2013-03-21 19:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO EDITOR:

Dear Sir Editor-in-Chief WJA Dear Sir The hypothesis / or clinical problem tested in this investigation is not new but the methodology is clear. The findings can have direct implication on clinical practice but authors could not express a decisive conclusion. They have to rewrite their conclusion in favour of one or the other option.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Dear authors The methodology of the investigation is sound and can support the outcome. However some minor revisions in the manuscript are required to make the investigation more useful. I have following suggestions. 1. Introduction There are too many aspects mentioned in the introduction and too many references cited. This will confuse the reader. You have to state the principal objective clearly i.e. whether there has no such drug or dose finding study been conducted for ambulatory knee arthroscopy or there are studies but their results have been questioned or their results were contradictory. Do not go into details of spinal anaesthesia for other procedures. Principal objective should be very focused (to find out Bupivacaine or levobupivacaine is preferable?) What is your hypothesis? Bupivacaine will be better or levobupivacaine? Then investigate, prove or reject the null hypothesis. 2. Conclusion When you will decide a focused objective, then automatically, you will be able to draw a focused conclusion. 3. Discussion As there are many references, it will be confusing for the reader. Cite the references, only pertinent to ambulatory surgery and not for c-sections. Limit your discussion to 1/3rd of the total length of the manuscript. Prefer to cite the studies on ambulatory knee arthroscopy and how your findings support or differ from their findings. You have to mention the strengths and weaknesses of your investigation (are there any new findings?). Recommend some directions for further research, such as 4mg Bupivacaine with fentanyl, etc. Thank you. I wish you the best.