

Review of: "Identification of Epidural Space: A Comparison Study Between Contrast Spread and Loss of Resistance Techniques"

Maurizio Marchesini

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The basic idea of the work appears attractive:

evaluate a more confident, safe, and reproducible approach to epidural infiltration, particularly at the cervical level, where the risks are more significant.

The fluoroguided only approach to the epidural space is described as feasible. The author implements it by demonstrating the possibility of finding it even with a tiny diameter needle compared to the usual techniques.

However, the drafting of the article is lacking in several aspects:

- the tone of the text appears excessively colloquial;
- Some passages are not fully clarified (for example, the contralateral oblique vision technique), which should be more in-depth than other completely alien data for the work (such as reporting one's own not methodologically clear case history with completely different anecdotal adverse events).
- the statistical part is unnecessarily complex, correct from the methodological point of view, but it could have been more linear with more easy tests, even if one understands the difficulty of comparing results with high/complete success rates.
- there are no fluoroscopic images. The reader less accustomed to pain therapy and fluoroscopic management of infiltrations would undoubtedly have liked to view it.
- the completely arbitrary choice of the type of technique according to the patient (albeit reported by the author) dramatically reduces the scientific reproducibility and the quality of the final data.
- the references should be re-edited looking for greater coherence (ref 18 authors underlined); I would remove youtube from the references.