Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_84835**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of Spinal Anesthesia on Postoperative Cognitive Dysfunction**
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

	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	This paper discussed the effect of spinal anesthesia on postoperative cognitive decline in elderly patients. The results in this paper showed that spinal anesthesia had no effects on memory coefficient. While there was an increase in some memory function domains, including spatial addition, navigation, and logical memory after the operation. And the memory scores may have been affected by the patients' conditions before the operation. This paper is generally well written. I have the following comments: 1.For the used dataset, since this paper studied the effect of spinal anesthesia on postoperative cognitive decline in elderly patients, it suggested that some relevant demographic information, such as detail age distribution, should be provided. 2.Please merge the comparison for the same demographic characteristic in Figures 1 and 2 in the same Figure, for example, put the "correlation of memory coefficient before/after spinal anesthesia with age" in the same Figure with different colour points, then the comparison will be much clearer.	
Minor REVISION comments	There are several tiny issues: 1.The first subgraph in Figure 2 is the reverse of left and right; 2. In References, for each word in the title of the paper, some of it is capitalized, some of it is not, please use the same format; for example, Ref. [6] vs. Ref. [5]; 3. In References, the position about page information of the cited paper, are not consistent, sometimes it is at the end of the cited paper, sometimes it is after the authors; for instance, Ref. [9] vs. Ref. [10]; 4. Some author names, all capitals, such as Ref.[17]	
Optional/General comments	In addition, if possible, in the future, I suggested that, based on the P-values in Table 2, the author(s) should rank and select the important factors and then consider the performance of downstream classifier on these selected factors	

	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:	**Xinxing Wu**
Department, University & Country	**University of Kentucky, United States**