

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 Grade E: Do not publish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: bpgooffice@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.