

## EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

### *(1) Science editor:*

The author reviews the results of different minimally invasive surgery for vertebral compression fractures: an observational study, and puts forward several shortcomings of the publication, which I think is of certain value.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Response: Thanks very much for stating positive comments to our letter. The language is modified in the current version.

### *(2) Company editor-in-chief:*

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Response: The comment stated by above is appreciated very much. Thanks for acceptance.

### *Reviewer #1:*

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** This letter to the editor commented on an earlier published article & raised a couple of shortcomings of the publication, including a lack of randomization method & therapeutic details. The raised points are valid & warrant publication. Perhaps a response from the original authors on raised issues would benefit the readership.

Response: Many thanks for your positive view towards our letter. This is really an encouragement for us.

### *Reviewer #2:*

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Rejection

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The authors have commented on "Outcomes of different minimally invasive surgical treatments for vertebral compression fractures: An observational study". In the original research article the authors have not suggested that the study is a randomized controlled trial. They have clearly mentioned that data was collected retrospectively and the patients were randomly divided into five categories for the purpose analysis. So the first comment should be removed. The language needs further refinement.

Response: Many thanks for your comment on our letter. Since this is not a randomized controlled trial, it should not be stated "randomly" in the "Methods" section. On ground of this, we stated the point in our letter. Regarding the language, we have modified it in the current version. Your valuable opinion is appreciated very much.