

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Anesthesiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26345

Title: Interventional Pain Therapy in Cervical Post-surgery Syndrome

Reviewer's code: 00506103

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-08 16:36

Date reviewed: 2016-04-19 00:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is interesting. The introduction is comprehensive. I suggest to develop conclusions, inserting the risks of the proposed two therapeutic approaches, epidural or thermal radiofrequency neurotomy / medial branch block and any specific indications for one or the other technique. For epidural block is interesting to discuss if there are difference between the intralaminar or intraforaminal approach. The abstract should contain part of the conclusions.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Anesthesiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26345

Title: Interventional Pain Therapy in Cervical Post-surgery Syndrome

Reviewer's code: 02482577

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-08 16:36

Date reviewed: 2016-05-07 00:19

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a well written paper. Congrats!

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Anesthesiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26345

Title: Interventional Pain Therapy in Cervical Post-surgery Syndrome

Reviewer's code: 00526025

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-08 16:36

Date reviewed: 2016-05-07 12:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author reviewed "Interventional pain therapy in cervical post-surgery syndrome." The manuscript is concise and informative. The manuscript would be more understandable if the author define some words in the text. General comments: I would recommend the author concisely define the words, such as radicular symptoms, axial pain, facet joint pain, adjacent level syndrome, discogenic pain and so on in the text. If the author's meaning of "facet joint" and "zygapophysial joint" are the same, I would recommend the authors use either only "facet joint" or "zygapophysial joint." Specific comments: "Approximately" before 15% to 40% should be deleted. Page 10, second paragraph: I would recommend "Severe complications" of transforaminal injections be mentioned. END

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Anesthesiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26345

Title: Interventional Pain Therapy in Cervical Post-surgery Syndrome

Reviewer's code: 02489089

Reviewer's country: Austria

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-08 16:36

Date reviewed: 2016-05-08 22:17

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, thanks a lot for sending your article. It is a well done overview in the field of international pain therapy in cervical post-surgery syndrome and I am happy to say that I can fully accept your article for publication. Regards! Your Reviewer

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Anesthesiology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26345

Title: Interventional Pain Therapy in Cervical Post-surgery Syndrome

Reviewer's code: 02482724

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-08 16:36

Date reviewed: 2016-05-12 09:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author tried to review the study of Interventional Pain therapy in CPSS. There are some problems as listed below: 1. Please check the text carefully, including spelling, such as in P4L2 witch, P6L9 An other, P8L11 Furthermorer,....Some sentences are hard to understand, such as P5 "The common feature is that the pain fails to achieve the expected outcome of the surgery by both the patient and the surgeon [8]." 2. Abbreviations such as RF, CPSS should be defined at first appearance and used after that. 3. What is the mechanism of CPSS, it can be listed as a subsection 4. Table 1 only listed 3 studies, however, there are many studies were discussed in the text. And the reference 11 is not 21. 5. Only based on one study [ref10], it is hard to define 59% as a threshold. 6. Many statements like the last sentence in P11 make no sense.