

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2453
Title of the Manuscript:	Beware while Treating Post-Spinal Headache!
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a crucial issue in obstetric anaesthesia—Post-Spinal Headache (PSH), which is a common complication following spinal anaesthesia. The topic is significant because PSH can lead to serious neurological consequences if not managed properly. The manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it not only reviews the pathophysiology and management of PSH but also emphasizes the need for awareness among obstetricians to avoid medico-legal complications. The emphasis on postpartum follow-up adds practical relevance to the manuscript. In general: This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of PSH, an essential topic in obstetric anaesthesia. It is scientifically sound and highlights the importance of proper diagnosis and management, particularly in the postpartum period. The discussion on potential medico-legal issues underscores its practical significance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Beware while Treating Post-Spinal Headache!" is appropriate and effectively captures the manuscript's focus on the caution required in managing PSH. Comment: The title is suitable and aligns well with the manuscript's content. It effectively communicates the cautionary approach needed in treating PSH.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is clear and provides a succinct summary of the key points discussed in the manuscript. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the specific recommendations or guidelines proposed. In general: The abstract is comprehensive, but it would be improved by including a sentence on the recommendations for PSH management discussed in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-organized, with clear subsections covering pathophysiology, diagnosis, treatment, and follow-up. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and enhance the readability of the content.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, with accurate descriptions of PSH and evidence-based recommendations. It effectively integrates recent research to provide a comprehensive review of the topic.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	The references are sufficient and recent, covering a broad spectrum of studies relevant to PSH. However, the inclusion of more recent studies or guidelines on PSH management could further strengthen the manuscript. The references are adequate and current. The manuscript would benefit from the addition of recent studies or guidelines on PSH management.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and concise expression throughout the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Based on the thorough review, the manuscript primarily synthesizes existing knowledge. It is scientifically sound, well-organized, and highly relevant to the field of obstetric anaesthesia. Minor revisions to the abstract and references are suggested. This is typical for a review-type article or book chapter, but it's crucial to ensure that all sources are properly cited. This is manuscript relevant and adds value to the literature, especially for practitioners in obstetric anaesthesia.	

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:	Ame Imasin Faris
Department, University & Country	Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia