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

Igor Wilderman

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

This is a well conducted real world clinical study. With all declared limitations, such as small sample size and lack of randomization for the needle size, it carries certain scientific value. The study was approved by an Ethic board as it states in the article and I was surprised to read in one of the reviews that it wasn't. The reviewed probably did not read the article in detail. The main research point was to evaluate efficacy of the Fluoroscopy only method (FOM) versus the standard LOR technique. The author also tried to evaluate the accuracy of different needle sizes. Looks like it was the secondary objective. Even though one might think that everyone knows that the Fluoroscopy is more precise than the LOR, this study is a formal research confirming this assumption. It is really important to decrease the rate of complications and increase the accuracy of cervical epidural injections. I believe the question of the best needle size remains open. There are many factors to consider as described in the article. More studies may be required to establish FOM as a new standard of care.