

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_78538
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Study of Patients Outcomes by Using Dexmedetomidine with Bupivacaine versus Bupivacaine Alone in Ultrasound-Guided Thoracolumbar Interfacial Plane Block for Spine Surgeries.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Patients and metode. 2 patients were excluded due to length of procedure, this is not specified in exclusion criteria.</p> <p>Allocation consealment The procedure needs to be described more clearly. It is unclear when the patient was randomised, who had access to group allocation, if the envelope was sealed during the entire periode from randomisation til end of follow up.</p> <p>Administration of nerve block. It is unclear when the nerve block was administered, who performed the block. Who prepared the medication? Whether the person performing the block was blinded to group allocation. Was the perioperative team, the PACU and outcome assessor postoperatively blinded to group allocation? How was data logged? Case report form, directly into a seperate database or the patient's chart?</p> <p>Statistical analysis In the sample size calculation, what expected effect size was the calculation based on? Which statistical test was used in the analysis and did this test take repeated measures into account? Has the statistical analysis controlled for multiple comparisons?</p> <p>Results Table 1. Confidence intervals need to be reported for each comparison. The mean values and range are very close between groups. With an N=30 in each group a significance level of <0,0001 seems unlikel.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Results A table describing patient characteristics instead of text.</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martin Malling Sundskard
Department, University & Country	Nordsjaellands Hospital, University of Copenhagen, Denmark