

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 62047

Title: Clinical and radiological outcomes of dynamic cervical implant arthroplasty: A 5-year follow-up

Reviewer's code: 03517589

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-28 16:47

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-03 14:37

Review time: 5 Days and 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 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

Dear Colleagues, Thank you very much for the clear summary of the clinical and radiological data regarding a mid-term follow-up of the DCI implant. You report on a 5 year FU of 40 patients (FU rate 80%) that provides excellent results. Only one implant showed migration not requiring revision. The rate of heterotopic ossification, especially of higher grade, is also extremely low. To be honest, this does not correspond to my personal experience, but perhaps there is a difference here in the individual surgical technique or the individual patient prerequisites. However, it should be mentioned on the basis of which examination this detection was made. A CT examination is listed as an example in figure 3. If the CT was the standard examination, this should be mentioned and, above all, discussed again, as the figures for this are extremely low. The classification of the HO according to McAfee is also not entirely correct, as lumbar prostheses form the basis here. This should also be mentioned or the modified grading should be used. Unfortunately, there are still ambiguities regarding the percentage evaluation. Table 1 lists exactly 40 treated levels. This does not reflect the number of treated levels in the text (n=46). Here, absolutely transparent clarity should be provided to confirm the credibility of the figures. Table 1 also indicates a hospitalization period of 10 days. Is there a specific reason for this , or is this due to the local healthcare system ? In principle, this work is clearly structured with very good clinical and radiological results. For the discussion I personally would also be interested in how you chose the indication for implantation of this implant. What is the difference between the indication and the conventional cervical total disc prosthesis ? In summary, this manuscript needs some minor revisions to be published.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 62047

Title: Clinical and radiological outcomes of dynamic cervical implant arthroplasty: A 5-year follow-up

Reviewer's code: 03517589

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-01 06:38

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-01 06:59

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
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

The revision of the questions and suggestions are now absolutely coherent and sufficient.
I would now like to make my recommendation for the publication of the manuscript.
Thank you !