

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71399

**Title:** Sequential sagittal alignment changes in the cervical spine after occipitocervical fusion

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03471292

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-10-01 03:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-10-10 08:26

**Review time:** 9 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

Authors have presented their work on Sequential sagittal alignment changes in the cervical spine after occipitocervical fusion. General Comments 1. Authors mention that it is retrospective study. However, the language of the text is as if it were a prospective study. For example, the authors mention “The effectiveness of OCF surgery in restoring CSA may be limited by the realignment of the craniocervical junction being neglected”. Similarly in results section, it has been mentioned “A total of 84 patients were enrolled in the OCF group.” How can it be retrospective study if authors are enrolling them for study. If it is a retrospective study, cases must come from hospital records and control can be enrolled. Also looking at the tables and data collection, it doesn’t appear to be a retrospective study as two follow-ups are there. Authors may please explain and correct the study design mentioned in the article accordingly. 2. Authors have done their study on “Sequential sagittal alignment changes in the cervical spine after occipitocervical fusion”. Further authors have mentioned “We considered the main reason to be that we focused on decompression, reduction, and fusion for the treatment of craniocervical disorders but neglected the importance of restoring craniocervical sagittal alignment”. If authors had not done anything to restore the craniocervical sagittal alignment, then how did they accept it to change? In other words how did they feel the need of the study. 3. Authors have mentioned “A lateral radiograph of the cervical spine was obtained at baseline, 1- month and the last follow- up after OCF surgery”. Authors may clarify as to how they could draw this conclusion from the study. 4. Authors may discuss quoting evidence, reliability of data collection through telephonic conversation. Does data collection through telephonic conversation lead to

bias which confounds the outcome of the study? Specific Comments 1. Authors have not mentioned the Age group in the inclusion criteria. Was this not considered? 2.

Authors may consider discussing about the measures to prevent DYSPHAGIA in OCF. 3. Authors may consider removing the word “all” from statistical analysis section such as “All data...” and “All values...”. 4. Please give p-value to verify the sentence “However, the proportion of female patients was significantly higher in the patients with dysphagia”. 5. In Table 2 and Table 3, p-value is calculated and interpreted for many comparisons. However, authors did not mention anything about the multiple comparison criteria. 6. What do authors mean by “Pearson correlation’s mean”? 7. In Table 3, please mention statistical method used to calculate each and every p-value. 8. Authors mention about one-way ANOVA. However repeated measures ANOVA would be the suitable method for analysing this data. Authors may please justify. Also some of the variables are asymmetrically distributed, whereas same statistical method has been used for analysing all variables without checking assumptions for the tests. Statistical analysis needs special attention. Authors may do needful

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 71399

**Title:** Sequential sagittal alignment changes in the cervical spine after occipitocervical fusion

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05207387

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-10-12 04:30

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-10-15 01:16

**Review time:** 2 Days and 20 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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Thanks for recommending me as a reviewer. This paper was aimed to compare the CSA of patients with CJD with that of normal controls and investigate the sequential changes in the CSA of the upper and lower cervical spine after OCF. If authors complete minor revisions, the quality of the study will be further improved. 1. The introduction section is well written. If the authors describe research trends on "CSA of patients with CJD" in more detail in the introduction section, it can help readers understand.