

POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSES TO THE REVIEWERS

Reviewer Comments

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

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.

Response: Thanks for your recognition!

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?

Reviewer: Yes. Key information is summarized and reflected in abstract.

Response: Thanks for your comment!

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript?

Reviewer: Yes. It's OK.

Response: Thanks for your kind comment!

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study?

Reviewer: Yes.

Response: Thanks for your recognition!

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.

Response: Thanks for your comments and helping to identify the sentence error! (1) The radiographic measurements were obtained by two independent spine surgeons to reduce the measurement bias, and one of the authors collected of clinical outcomes without awareness of the grouping information. (2) After checking this section, we corrected the clerical error.

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.

Response: Thanks for your recognition!

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings 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.

Response: Thanks for your recognition!

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.

Response: Thanks for your careful review! We have checked the original data and the statistical results and confirmed that the right P value was 0.008, which supported the expression that “As for sagittal pelvic parameters, PI was similar to that recorded prior to operation, while SS significantly increased”. The P value in the sentence was corrected to 0.008, and the original data was also submitted.

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics?

Reviewer. Yes.

Response: Thanks for your recognition!

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units?

Reviewer: Yes.

Response: Thanks for your recognition!

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.

Response: Thanks for your careful review!

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.

Response: Thanks for your kind comment!

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) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective 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 performed this retrospective study according to STROBE statement properly. It would be better to submit a STROBE checklist.

Response: Thanks for your review! We have submitted a STROBE checklist with the revised manuscript.

14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed 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 sentence "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.

Response: Thanks for your important comments. We resubmitted the modified file with

complete information and signature to the ethics committee in our hospital, and the relevant files was also resubmitted to the F6Publishing system.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

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.

Response: Thanks for your careful review and recognition for our work!