

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71943

Title: Effectiveness of pulsed radiofrequency on the medial cervical branches for cervical facet joint pain

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05196172

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-09 04:25

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-18 14:11

Review time: 9 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? I would recommend it be specified as to what anatomical structure is receiving pulsed RF. Eg. "Effectiveness of pulsed radiofrequency of the medial cervical branches for cervical facet joint pain"

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Line 136 – Thoracic or Cervical?

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? The objective was to determine the efficacy of pulsed RF in CFP. As per the authors there was a mean decrease in the NRS score by more than 50%, which was statistically significant.

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes. Further elaboration on the other available modalities for the treatment of cervical facet pain is required. Also, a comparison between the currently available modalities for treatment in the form of a chart or a table would complete the discussion. "approximately half of the patients reported successful pain relief ($\geq 50\%$ pain reduction), and this effect lasted for at least 3 months. Furthermore, about half of the patients



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

showed satisfaction with the results following PRF stimulation” – Of the 50% patients that had successful pain relief, were the same 50% satisfied with the result? If so, kindly integrate the two into one sentence. The present writing style is misleading to the reader.

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? The journal requires references to be cited as follows (for example): Kirpalani D, Mitra R. Cervical facet joint dysfunction: a review. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008 Apr;89(4):770-4. PMID: 18374011. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2007.11.028. List all authors, deleting the period (.) between the abbreviated name of the journal and the year of publication, after of the volume and number of the journal, write down the pages. In addition to the DOI, add the PMID.

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Minor grammatical corrections required. One of present/past tense needs to be standardized throughout the manuscript. Manuscript is well ordered.

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

- Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Incompletely used CARE checklist. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? The study is retrospective. The authors mention approval by the institutional review board. First, what are the original findings of this manuscript? What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed? What are the new phenomena that were found through experiments in this study? What are the hypotheses that were confirmed through experiments in this study? The authors recommend the use of pulsed radiofrequency, an established treatment modality for various pain conditions and syndromes, for the management of cervical facet pain. The effectiveness of this procedure has been shown in this study of 21 patients. Second, what are the quality and importance of this manuscript? What are the new findings of this study? What are the new concepts that this study proposes? What are the new methods that this study proposed? Do the conclusions appropriately summarize the data that this study provided? What are the unique insights that this study presented? What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved? The study proposes the use of pulsed RF for the management of cervical facet pain. Albeit the concept of using pulsed RF for facet pain is not new, there are few studies in literature on the subject. Third, what are the limitations of the study and its findings? What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript? What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved? What are the questions that this study prompts for the authors to do next? How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice? The authors mention the limitations. In addition, clarification on the same/ different specialists performing the surgery would shed light on operator



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

bias in the results. Authors' view on possible reasons for non-improvement in 5 patients should be added.