

Review of: "Radiological parameters after LLIF for adjacent-level disease treatment"

Marc Prod'homme¹

¹ Clinique de La Source

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors,

I had the privilege to review your interesting manuscript. I formulated some comments. Please take them as advice to improve your manuscript.

I wish you all the best for this manuscript and future research as well.

Your Reviewer

ABSTRACT

- please explain "LLIF" abbreviation first
- you forgot to write the study design (prospective or retrospective)
- you also forgot to write the background: patients with previous lumbar fusion and secondary ASD
- "informed consent" is not a useful information in the Abstract
- in the Results, you made a rehearsal ("were included in this study")
- I think that preoperative SVA and postoperative SVA should be mentionned in the results

INTRODUCTION

- you forgot to explain "TLIF", "PLIF" and "PLF" abbreviations first
- "ASD" is rather "adjacent-segment disease"
- "stenosis" is not a symptom

METHODS

- you forgot the study design: prospective or retrospective
- you forgot to write about Institutional Review Board etc.
- "free" about consent form is obvious and should be erased
- "postoperative lumbar X-rays" instead
- standalone LLIF or LLIF with posterior screws?

- you should detail the kind of radiographs: standing AP and LAT lumbar including femoral heads
- outcomes: I suggest to add pre- and postoperative sagittal vertical axes (SVA) in your analysis, but in this case you need standing cervico-thoraco-lumbar (full spine) radiographs
- statistics: “According to the best approach to show them” should be erased
- an illustration of your LLIF technique would be welcome

RESULTS

- age before levels, please
- Table 1: what are “Gênero” and “Nivel”? please add “Number” or “Nr.”
- radiological data: what are the numbers between round brackets?
- Figures 1, 2 and 3: what are “FUP”, “Pré”, “Pós” and “Lombar”?
- you did not explain what is “lumbar mismatch” in the Methods section

DISCUSSION

- I suggest to begin with the most important finding in your study
- the first paragraph is rehearsal of the Introduction and should be erased
- “LLIF in the treatment of adjacent level disease” is useless sub-title
- limitations: I don't think a retrospective design a “fundamental weakness”, only one of the limitations
- I don't understand the whole limitations paragraph; please re-write it more clearly

CONCLUSION

- you forgot to detail if standalone LLIF or LLIF with posterior screws
- “multitude” should be erased
- further prospective studies assessing LLIF ... are needed to confirm these results