Reviewer’s report

Title: Bilateral Thoracic Paravertebral Block for Immediate Postoperative Pain Relief in the PACU: A Prospective, Observational Study

Version: 0 Date: 02 Jan 2017

Reviewer: Tetsuro Sakai

Reviewer’s report:

Bilateral Thoracic Paravertebral Block for Immediate Postoperative Pain Relief in the PACU: A Prospective, Observational Study

ABSTRACT: include the information of local anesthetic agent and dosage of each PVB. Specify the method as "a single shot PVB at bilateral T8-T9 space"

P4L15 "to severe pain. 2Intravenous" - adjust the reference citation and space


P4L13 "American Society of Anesthesiologists risk score I-II" - physical status

P4L21 "359 patients in total were recruited into this study". - state the indication of the BPVBs here. Why did not you offer the BTPVBs prior to the surgery?

P5L29 "0.3-0.5μg/kg." - a space. Same goes a lot of numbers with unit

P6L55 "Binary logistic regression and multivariate logistic regression models were used to identify risk factors of hypotension after BTPVB." - define hypotension and timing

P7L31 "The proportion of patients with VAS rest and cough less than 3 was also increased with time after BTPVB, reached 96% and 83% at 60 minutes after BTPVB (Fig 4)." - No need. Delete the sentence and Figure 4. Adjust the citation number of subsequent figures.

P7L1 "With a binary logistic regression model analysis, body weight, operative time, values of SBP, DBP before BTPVB were risk factors for hypotension." - show this information with data in the Table 1. Create hypotensive group and non-hypotensive group in the Table.

P9L22 "better analgesia outcomes" - compared to what?

P9L30 "for midline surgery" - what is midline surgery?
P9L33 "Epidural block is generally considered to be a good pain relief after laparotomy, but became less popular due to a variety of reasons including high incidence of hypotension and urinary retention, risks associated with the techniques such as neurological injury and paraplegia, difficult anatomy of middle thoracic epidural puncture." - please include and discuss on the recent RCT comparing epidural and BTPVBs: Schreiber KL, Chelly JE, Lang RS, Abuelkasem E, Geller DA, Marsh JW, Tsung A, Sakai T. Epidural Versus Paravertebral Nerve Block for Postoperative Analgesia in Patients Undergoing Open Liver Resection: A Randomized Clinical Trial. Reg Anesth Pain Med. 2016 Jul-Aug;41(4):460-8. doi: 10.1097/AAP.0000000000000422. PubMed

PMID: 27281726.

P9L36 "relief after for laparotomy" - delete after

P9L53 "Instead of multiple injections," - in this case, you have to compare single injection versus catheter technique, instead of multiple injections

P10L11 "indicating that multi-injections are not necessary" - same as the above.

P10 - need discussion of limitation of the study, especially why they use BTPVBs only as rescue rather than a preemptive fashion prior to laparotomy surgeries.

Figure 1 - to indicate when the consent was taken, describe as "359 patients consented to participate and arrived at PACU after operation"
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