Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Volume 14 · Issue 5 · e150753

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Effectiveness and Safety of Rhomboid Intercostal Block for Postoperative Pain Management in Thoracic and Breast Surgical Procedures: A Meta-analysis

Taufik Saputra, Doso Sutiyono, Widya Istanto Nurcahyo

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
17 Jul 2024	20 Aug 2024	31 Aug 2024	10.5812/aapm-150753

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Fatemeh Moftakhar, Referee 1, Parisa Moradimajd, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Fatemeh Moftakhar, Referee 1, Parisa Moradimajd, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4

Authors' reply to reviewers 5

Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

5 comments · 27 Jul 2024 – 10 Aug 2024

Fatemeh Moftakhar Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 27 Jul 2024

Dear Author
Thank you for your study.
References must be written based on the EndNote(References No 18 and 19).

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 3 Aug 2024

Dear Author

Thanks for doing this research. Please add a picture of this block. Another issue is the lack of studies used in the article, which reduces the result of obtaining a firm and accurate result.

Thank you

Parisa Moradimajd Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 5 Aug 2024

hi dear authors
1. background should be written more briefly in the abstract
2. It is better to change the title and mention effectiveness and safety in the title
3. Your databases are too small. Have you not checked Scopus and other databases?
4. Why did you choose the time range from 2019 to 2023?
5. Your conclusion in the abstract needs editing
6. Have you received the Prospero code? If registered in the system, the code should be written at the beginning of the execution method
7. The search strategy should be written based on PICO
8.) not thoracic or breast surgery. Because it is written as an entry criterion, it should be removed from the exit criteria
9. Which internationally recognized checklists have you checked the quality of the imported articles? To be mentioned in the execution method
10. limitations and suggestions should be written in the discussion
11. In Table 1, use the reference number instead of the number
12. Add the sample size in Table 1
13. In the prism diagram, the number of articles in each database should be written separately
14. Complete the captions and descriptions of the charts. Incompletely written

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 10 Aug 2024

Dear Editor in Chief,

Thanks for assigning me as associate editor to handle the manuscript NO.150753 entitled "Is Rhomboid Intercostal Block Effective for Postoperative Analgesia in Thoracic and Breast Surgical Procedures? A Meta-Analysis".

The manuscript needs some revision as requested by reviewers.
Authors should revise it based on comments one by one.
Regards,

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 10 Aug 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting the article. It needs some revision. Please revise it based on Reviewers and AE comments.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:
Question: Dear Author
Thank you for your study. References must be written based on the EndNote(References No 18 and 19).
Reply:
The references have been written based on EndNote software. (Page 14)
Reviewer 2:
Question:
1. background should be written more briefly in the abstract
2. It is better to change the title and mention effectiveness and safety in the title
3. Your databases are too small. Have you not checked Scopus and other databases?
4. Why did you choose the time range from 2019 to 2023?
5. Your conclusion in the abstract needs editing
6. Have you received the Prospero code? If registered in the system, the code should be written at the beginning of the execution method
7. The search strategy has been based on PICO. (Page 4)
8.”not thoracic or breast surgery. Because it is written as an entry criterion, it should be removed from the exit criteria
9. Which internationally recognized checklists have you checked the quality of the imported articles? To be mentioned in the execution method
10. limitations and suggestions should be written in the discussion
11. In Table 1, use the reference number instead of the number
12. Add the sample size in Table 1
13. In the prism diagram, the number of articles in each database should be written separately
14. Complete the captions and descriptions of the charts. Incompletely written
Reply:
1. The background has been changed to be more brief. (Page 1)
2. The title has been changed. Effectiveness and safety have been mentioned. (Page 1)
3. The databases have been added from Scopus and ProQuest, but no additional that met the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Most of the articles that write about RIB are kind of case reports or case series.
4. Trials from 2016 to 2023 were included because 2016 was the first time RIB was presented. Previously, I chose 2019 to exclude trials older than 5 years, but it seems that the results found were too small. (Page 3)
5. Abstract has been edited. (Page 2)
6. This meta-analysis is not yet registered in PROSPERO.
7. The search strategy has been written based on PICO. (Page 4)
8. “not thoracic or breast surgery” has been deleted from exclusion criteria (Page 4)
9. I have mentioned the GRADE guideline to check the quality of the imported articles. (Page 5)
10. The limitation and suggestions have been written in Page 12.
11 and 12. Reference number each study and sample size have been added to table 1. (Page 16)
13. Each the number of articles in each database on the PRISMA diagram has been written separately.
14. The description of each chart has been completely written.
Reviewer 3:
Question:
Thanks for doing this research. Please add a picture of this block. Another issue is the lack of studies used in the article, which reduces the result of obtaining a firm and accurate result.

Reply:
The figure of the rhomboid intercostal block has been added to this article without change of the figure or the caption. The figure is part of the an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. (Page 3)
Lack of studies : The databases have been added from Scopus and ProQuest, but no additional that met the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Most of the articles that write about RIB are kind of case reports or case series.

[Translated from Persian by the Brieflands editorial office.]

2 Revision 1

5 comments · 22 Aug 2024 – 31 Aug 2024

Fatemeh Moftakhar Reviewer — ACCEPT 22 Aug 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for your study. Your corrections are accepted.
Best Regards,

Referee 1 Reviewer — ACCEPT 26 Aug 2024

Dear Author

Thanks for responding and considering reviewers comments.

With the best regard

Parisa Moradimajd Reviewer — ACCEPT 27 Aug 2024

The article is well edited and acceptable

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 31 Aug 2024

Dear EIC.
Previous errors has been corrected and there is no any more recommendation.

Editor-in-Chief — ACCEPT 31 Aug 2024

Dear Author,
Your revisions have significantly improved the article, and it is now deemed acceptable for publication.
Congratulations on your hard work and dedication to enhancing the quality of your work.