

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

Dia Halalmeh

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

The methodology in the abstract is not clear and the primary and/or secondary endpoints of the study need to be elucidated. A limitation of this study may be the subjective nature of reporting the results (loss of resistance technique). In the results section of the abstract, the author mentioned confidence interval but it is not clear whether it was for mean difference, RR, etc. The second CI in the 25G group contains "0" which indicates no statistical significance if the mean difference was measured for both groups. In the results, what does the author mean by "LOR accuracy rate". This study is also subject to "observer" bias since the author is including his/her own patients, and exclusively relying on his interpretations and reporting of the results without cross-checking by other independent reviewers. Additionally, excluding patients without insurance coverage raises the concern for selection bias. The author also reports non-random classification of the patients into their respective group; further decreasing the reliability of the reported results. Finally, the study seems to be a personal opinion and experience of the author rather than an objective study with controlled variables and factors. This is evident in the discussion session where the author rarely cited or compared the results with other findings in the literature.

The article needs to be revised by a native speaker or professional medical writer for grammar mistakes and weak scientific language.