

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78453

Title: Radiological and clinical outcomes of midline lumbar fusion on sagittal lumbar-pelvic parameters for degenerative lumbar diseases

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05742869

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Kazakhstan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-26 04:26

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-03 09:03

Review time: 8 Days and 4 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**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>

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript named "Radiological and clinical outcomes of midline lumbar interbody fusion and minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion on sagittal lumbar-pelvic parameters for degenerative lumbar diseases" is well structured and demonstrates great science work.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78453

Title: Radiological and clinical outcomes of midline lumbar fusion on sagittal lumbar-pelvic parameters for degenerative lumbar diseases

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06364530

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-08-28 05:58

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-06 04:51

Review time: 8 Days and 22 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

Criteria Checklist for New Manuscript Peer-Review 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Reviewer: Yes. The title is appropriate. 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Reviewer: Yes. Key information is summarized and reflected in abstract. 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Reviewer: Yes. It's OK. 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Reviewer: Yes. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Reviewer: Yes, but it still needs improvement. Firstly, did the researchers perform blinding? Secondly, in section "Patients", should there be "included" in the end of sentences "Patients who underwent single-segment MILDF and MISTLIF for lower back pain, unilateral or bilateral lower-limb radiating pain, numbness, or intermittent claudication after strict conservative treatments for ≥ 3 months with complete preoperative and postoperative lateral lumbar X-ray images and ≥ 1 year of follow-up data after surgery were excluded." Please check. 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? Reviewer: Experiments performed in this research fits the research purposes well. Researchers objectively evaluated the impact of midline lumbar interbody fusion and minimally invasive transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion on sagittal lumbar-pelvic parameters in degenerative lumbar diseases treatment, which is unclear and important. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings



**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

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? Reviewer: Yes. This study clearly interpreted findings and highlighted key points concisely with a clear and definite manner. Discussion is accurate and discuss the scientific significance and clinical relevance sufficiently. 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? Reviewer: There is a discrepancy in Table 2 and third paragraph in section Results. The P value in sentence "As for sagittal pelvic parameters, PI was similar to that recorded prior to operation, while SS significantly increased ($P = 0.08$)" need to be checked. In table 2, it is 0.008. Besides, the tables show the results after statistical processing. It would be better to submit original data. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Reviewer. Yes. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Reviewer: 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? Reviewer: This manuscript cite appropriately. No self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references was found. 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? Reviewer: With the help of the Retouching Company-LetPub, the quality of organization and presentation is good. 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)



**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>

CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Me-ta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Ret-rospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Reviewer: The author preformed this retrospective study according to STROBE statement properly. It would be better to submit a STROBE checklist. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal ex-periments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were re-viewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Reviewer: Yes, but need improvement. In file "78453-Signed Informed Consent Form(s) or Document(s)", the start time of this study is incomplete. Please check sen-tence "受试者为本单位在 2019 年月至 2021 年三月于我院行 MIDLF 或 MISTLIF 术者". Besides, there is no sign of main researchers and sign date. Please complete.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78453

Title: Radiological and clinical outcomes of midline lumbar fusion on sagittal lumbar-pelvic parameters for degenerative lumbar diseases

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06364530

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-11

Reviewer chosen by: Kai-Le Chang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-08 06:23

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-10 06:10

Review time: 1 Day and 23 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think this manuscript is good and can be accepted for publication.