

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17287

**Title:** Perioperative outcomes in minimally invasive lumbar spine surgery: A systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 03035478

**Reviewer's country:** Netherlands

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-02-27 14:35

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-13 16:46

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 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 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

Thank you for your contribution. The manuscript presents a very concise and factual review of MIS and open lumbar surgery and as such is considered complete and acceptable. As this is a review paper, the only minor remark is that the article is maybe too concise and might benefit from further interpretation of some statements, however, that depends on the authors' preference and the journal's practices.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17287

**Title:** Perioperative outcomes in minimally invasive lumbar spine surgery: A systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 02904760

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-02-27 14:35

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-06 22:08

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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 authors present us a comprehensive systematic review regarding short term outcomes following MIS lumbar spine surgery. This topic is of interest and of novelty. Though several previous meta-analyses have compared surgical outcomes following standard and MIS TLIF procedures, they didn't concern other techniques like laminectomy or ALIF. Besides, with respect to language editing, no significant writing errors exist, making this manuscript easily understandable. However, the main disadvantage of this manuscript is it's too comprehensive that the authors could not focus on a specific point to discuss. It seems that it is necessary to rewrite the discussion part. Title: (1) Do the main and short titles accurately reflect the major topic and content of the study: Yes. Abstract: (1) Does the abstract provide a clear delineation between the research background, objectives, materials and methods, results (including important data), and conclusions: Yes. (2) Does the abstract present the innovative and significant points related to the background, objectives, materials and methods, results (including important data), and conclusions: Yes. Materials and Methods: (1) Are the materials and methods sufficiently described for the results and conclusions that are presented in the

preceding sections: No. For example: Statistical methods for pooling were not specified. (2) Are the methods advanced and/or applied in an innovative way: Yes. (3) Are sufficiently detailed descriptions provided for modified or novel methods used in the study, which will allow other investigators to reproduce or validate the study: Yes. (4) Is the study design and use of controls rational and reliable: Yes. (5) Are the statistical methods used appropriate: Not known. Results: (1) Do the results provide sufficient experimental evidence or data to draw firm scientific conclusions: Yes. (2) Are the sample size and statistical data especially graphical data that reflect the results adequate for a clinical study: Not applicable. Discussion: (1) Is the section well organized: Yes. (2) Are the conclusions drawn appropriately supported by the literature: Yes. (3) Does the section describe findings based upon systematic theoretical analyses of the results and provide valuable conclusions, while not merely repeating the data presented in the results section: No. Most of the discussion part is repeating results. References: (1) Are the references appropriate, relevant, and up-to-date: Yes. Tables and Figures: (1) Do the tables and/or figures reflect the major findings of the study: Yes. (2) Are the tables and/or figures designed to present the maximal amount of information in the most concise and clear manner: Yes.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17287

**Title:** Perioperative outcomes in minimally invasive lumbar spine surgery: A systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 02903410

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-02-27 14:35

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-22 10:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] 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"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

small languages polishing The discussion is too simple and should be analyse in depth.