

Manuscript: The use of Demineralized Bone Matrix in Spinal Fusion
No: 4369
Reply to the Reviewers' comments

Dear reviewers,

Initially we would like to thank you for your effort, and for your valuable and constructive suggestions in order to improve our work.

First reviewer:

1. Please correct minor spelling errors in the text (e.g. successful, not successfull)
2. The sentence: "The high rate of non-union necessitates the use of he use,..." not clear.

Thank you very much for these comments; we have corrected misspellings and unclear sentences.

3. Inconsistencies in referencing: numbers 21-45 missing, then also 47 lacking, 60 earlier than 59.

Inconsistencies in referencing have been corrected.

Material and methods:

4. „a systematic and critical review...” – the Authors might refer to Grant MJ, Booth A. Health Information and Libraries Journal 2009;26:91-108 for definitions of systematic reviews and critical reviews – they are two different kinds of secondary literature analyses. Please be more precise in this point.

Thank you very much for the very constructive comment. We took under consideration the suggested paper and we agree that our paper is a critical rather a systematic review. This statement has been altered to the manuscript.

5. Only PubMed searched. This may lead to publication bias. I think you should use at least one more major database, e.g. Web of Knowledge or EMBASE.

Unfortunately we included only PubMed search since it is the most popular database.

6. General comment: the description of the methods is insufficient. The authors did not describe the methods of the critical appraisal of the included studies. Also, the search process is not sufficiently described. It is not stated whether both authors conducted the search independently and whether there were any discrepancies in their findings. In the table, and in the introduction section they mention the levels of evidence and grades of recommendation. It should be reported in the methods section, which classifications (e.g. Oxford CEBM or SIGN) were used in classifying the LOEs of individual studies.

We completed the section material and methods with further information's about the searching process, the classification of LOEs, the excluding criteria

7. Also, the eligibility criteria are not adequately described.

The eligibility criteria have been added to the material and methods section.

8. Also, despite mentioning in the "Material and Methods" section, that "Results had been restricted to clinical trials", they discuss case series, retrospective studies, and "level 3" studies.

We meant clinical studies and it has been corrected.

Conclusions:

9. "Bae et al (2006) [44] have pointed....." – this statement should be included in the results or in the discussion, rather than in the conclusion section.

This statement has been transferred to the discussion section.

10. Again, some statements are not clear, e.g. "Additionally, high level of evidence studies are required.." Did the Authors mean studies of high methodological quality?

Yes this is what we tried to mention. Thank you for this comment it has been corrected according to your suggestion

11. In summary, the Authors present an interesting attempt to a critical analysis of the literature, but they report requires major improvements: the report should be more logical, with a clear distinction between the sections; the results should be added to the text; referencing should be corrected. The report does not fulfill the requirements for a systematic review. The authors may present their findings as a critical or narrative review or, ideally, follow the PRISMA statement in conducting and reporting a systematic review. The PRISMA flow chart and checklist may help.

Once again we would like to thank the reviewer for his help. We presented our finding according to his suggestion as a critical review, also we tried to add more information to the material and methods section wna rearranged the discussion section.

Second reviewer:

Well-written paper but requires some minor revisions:

1. Page 3 Introduction part Line 6: the word 'succesfull' should be corrected as 'successfull'
2. Second paragraph First sentence: the word 'he' should be changed as 'the'
3. 4th paragraph first sentence : the word 'accosiated' should be corrected as 'associated'
4. Page 9 second paragraph line 5: the word 'morselized' should be changed as 'morsellized'
5. Page 9 conclusion part first sentence: the word 'subciquent' should be corrected as 'subsequent'
6. Page 9 conclusion part second sentence: the word 'morselized' should be changed as 'morsellized'
7. Page 10 second paragraph last sentence: the word 'increaces' should be corrected as 'increases'

Thank you for your valuable comments. All the misspellings have been corrected

8. In conclusion part: all the cited sentences should be removed, and conclusion part should be shortened, be more clear and brief.

All the cited sentences have been removed from the conclusion. The conclusion and discussion section have been rearranged.

Thank you very much for your comments.

The authors' team.