



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 56500

Title: Anterior bone loss after cervical disc replacement: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 03517589

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-06

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-08-09 19:09

Reviewer performed review: 2020-08-10 16:33

Review time: 21 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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**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

Thank you very much for the summary of a not yet very well known radiological phenomenon when using CDR. The paper is written as a systematic review, so I do not have the exact criteria of which studies were selected. How many studies were considered in total, how many were rejected and why? Nevertheless, the topic has been reviewed, summarized and evaluated accordingly. Even if the significance for the daily clinical work is still low, I read the paper with interest. The discussion deals with possible causes and evaluates these theories. I would also like to mention the suspicion that the two Kieser studies (26/27) are largely based on the same cohorts, which certainly distorts the evaluation. Assuming that the methodology is presented in more detail, it is worth publishing.