

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_130602
Title of the Manuscript:	Labor Analgesia and Its Impact on Maternal and Neonatal Outcomes: Balancing Benefits, Risks, and Unresolved Questions
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Labor pain is a significant experience influenced by uterine contractions and cervical dilation, necessitating effective analgesia to improve maternal and neonatal outcomes. Neuraxial techniques, such as epidural and spinal analgesia, are considered the gold standard due to their efficacy and safety, while non-neuraxial methods vary in effectiveness and side effects. This review evaluates the impact of these techniques on maternal and neonatal outcomes, addressing ongoing controversies and identifying areas for future research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound based on the information provided in the extracted pages. It systematically evaluates the impact of labor analgesia techniques on both maternal and neonatal outcomes, which is a critical area of research in obstetric care. The objectives clearly outline the focus on labor progression, mode of delivery, postpartum recovery, and neonatal outcomes such as Apgar scores and breastfeeding initiation.</p> <p>The methods section describes a structured narrative review that includes a comprehensive search of multiple databases, ensuring a robust selection of studies, including randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews. This approach enhances the credibility of the findings and conclusions drawn in the manuscript.</p> <p>Furthermore, the findings indicate that neuraxial analgesia provides superior pain relief with minimal systemic side effects, while also addressing potential risks such as prolonged labor and increased rates of instrumental delivery. The discussion of controversies surrounding the effects of analgesia on labor progression and neonatal health is also well-articulated, highlighting the need for further research in these areas.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript demonstrates a thorough understanding of the complexities involved in labor analgesia and its implications for maternal and neonatal health, making it a valuable contribution to the field.</p>	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<div>1. Khamooshi F, Doraji-Bonjar S, Akinnawo AS, Ghaznavi H, Salimi-Khorashad AR, and Khamooshi MJ (2023) Dark Classics in Chemical Neuroscience: Comprehensive Study on the Biochemical Mechanisms and Clinical Implications of Opioid Analgesics. Chemical Methodologies 7(12): 964-993. DOI: 10.48309/chemm.2023.414616.1731</div> <div>2. Khamooshi F, Akinnawo AS, Doraji-Bonjar S, and Modarresi-Alam AR (2024) Mitragynine Chemistry: Extraction, Synthesis, and Clinical Effects. Chemistry Africa. DOI: 10.1007/s42250-024-00921-6</div> <div>3. Khamooshi F, Mousavi SM, Doraji-Bonjar S, and Zolfigol M (2022) Anti-HIV Drugs Study: Study of NNRTIs Function and Overview Synthesis of Specific and Rare Aryloxy Tetrazoles Derivatives as NNRTIs and Anti-HIV Drug. Medicon Pharmaceutical Sciences 2(3): 04-10. DOI: <a href="https://themedicon.com/pdf/mcps/MCPS-22-034.pdf">https://themedicon.com/pdf/mcps/MCPS-22-034.pdf</a></div>	Good suggested references but all current references already cover the first suggestion comprehensively. The other two suggested references may fall out of the scope and context of the article.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<div>The research document appears to be well-structured and coherent overall, but there are some areas where writing and grammar issues can be identified.</div> <div>Some sentences are lengthy and complex, which may hinder clarity. For example, the sentence discussing the implications of analgesia on neonatal outcomes could be simplified for better readability: "The implications of analgesia on neonatal outcomes—such as breastfeeding initiation,</div>	<div>Understood, however, the complexity in some instances has to remain since it addresses multiple aspects of the research. The phrase that was highlighted <i>“Furthermore, the implications of analgesia on neonatal outcomes—such as breastfeeding initiation, immediate adaptability at birth, and long-term neurodevelopment—remain areas of ongoing investigation.”</i> cannot necessarily be changed. It forms part of the introduction and rationale for the study. It sets a standard for the content of the study and immediately initiates the concern for neonatal outcomes.</div> <div>I am unable to find the grammatical errors suggested by the reviewer. Prior to submission, extensive proofreading and assessment was done. Currently, there are no or only trivial amounts of errors that would not affect or hinder the quality of the research and the authors are confident in this.</div>
Optional/General comments	<div>It is good, after the revision, in my opinion, it has scientific value for publication</div> <div>The writing needs to be retouched and the references should be added in the history of pain and complications management section</div> <div>Advantages and Disadvantages of the Research Advantages:</div> <div>1. Comprehensive Evaluation: The research provides a structured narrative review that synthesizes evidence from various studies, including randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews, to evaluate the impact of labor analgesia on both maternal and neonatal outcomes.</div> <div>2. Focus on Maternal and Neonatal Outcomes: It specifically addresses key maternal outcomes such as labor progression, mode of delivery, and postpartum recovery, alongside neonatal outcomes like Apgar scores and breastfeeding initiation, which are critical for understanding the full impact of analgesia techniques.</div> <div>3. Identification of Evidence Gaps: The review highlights areas for future research, particularly regarding the long-term neurodevelopmental impact of different analgesic methods, thus guiding future studies and clinical practices.</div> <div>Disadvantages:</div> <div>1. Controversies and Conflicting Evidence: The research acknowledges ongoing controversies regarding the effects of neuraxial analgesia on labor duration and delivery outcomes, which may lead to confusion among practitioners and patients.</div> <div>2. Limited Long-Term Data: While the review discusses immediate neonatal outcomes extensively, it notes that there is limited evidence regarding the long-term neurodevelopmental effects of labor analgesia, particularly concerning systemic opioids and nitrous oxide.</div> <div>3. Variability in Access: The research points out disparities in access to effective pain relief during childbirth, particularly in low-resource settings, which may limit the applicability of findings across different populations.</div> <div>This research has significant scientific and publishing value for several reasons:</div> <div>1. Comprehensive Review: The study provides a structured narrative review that synthesizes evidence from various highquality sources, including randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews, focusing on the impact of labor analgesia on maternal and neonatal outcomes. This comprehensive approach enhances the understanding of the subject matter and contributes to the existing body of knowledge.</div>	

Review Form 3

	<div>2. Addressing Key Issues: The research tackles important controversies and unresolved questions surrounding labor analgesia, such as its effects on labor progression, delivery outcomes, and neonatal health. By highlighting these issues, the study encourages further investigation and discussion within the scientific community.</div> <div>3. Practical Implications: The findings offer actionable insights for clinicians, emphasizing the need for individualized, evidence-based approaches to labor analgesia. This practical relevance enhances the research's value, as it can directly inform clinical practices and improve patient care.</div> <div>4. Future Research Directions: The review identifies gaps in the current literature and suggests areas for future research, such as the long-term neurodevelopmental impact of different analgesic techniques. This forward-looking perspective is crucial for advancing the field and ensuring continuous improvements in obstetric care.</div> <div>5. Standardization of Outcome Reporting: The study advocates for standardized definitions and reporting metrics in obstetric anesthesia research, which is essential for improving the quality and comparability of future studies. This emphasis on methodological rigor further enhances its scientific value.</div> <div>Overall, the research contributes valuable insights to the field of obstetric anesthesia and labor pain management, making it a significant addition to scientific literature.</div>	
--	---	--

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)	