

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_119969
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of lumbar spondylolisthesis: A retrospective analysis of the contribution of minimally invasive surgery for lumbar spondylolisthesis
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(its a single centre retrospective analysis of 8-months data so reproducibility is low. Language of manuscript body is poor)</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>No (Methodology and result-oriented conclusory remarks missing) All 29-patients underwent MIS TLIF so title may be modified accordingly</li> <li>Not up to mark of journal. May be asked to revise grammar and syntax.</li> <li>Yes, being a retrospective audit of surgical management the article is scientifically correct but adding nothing to known facts.</li> <li>Yes</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes, <b>May be asked to revise grammar and syntax. In abstract authors writes</b> "The results of recently published series are reported" I believe authors should focus on their methods and results.</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>I would like to congratulate the authors for starting MIS TLIF in their department. As the methodology shows that no comparison has been made with non-MIS patients, authors may avoid using "benefit" word in conclusion.</p> <p>The lines "All patients benefited from prior medical treatment with failure" "Surgical treatment was required in all patients in our study, using the minimally invasive transforaminal interbody fusion method." I request authors to highlight indications of TLIF and why a decision was made for not using PLIF so that readers should learn from article.</p> <p>When the authors writes "Therapeutic management of spondylolisthesis includes a medical, orthopedic and surgical component.", what orthopedic management is needed may be highlighted. Further, authors write "The aim was above all to eliminate the painful symptoms and the neurological deficit" but result section should show a paragraph on improvement in neurological deficit.</p> <p>Finally the authors have concluded that "The determining factor in determining the indication for surgery is the failure of medical and orthopedic treatment and the persistence or even worsening of the symptoms." but there are some radiological parameters and selective patients for TLIF.</p>	
----------------------------------	--	--

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suyash Singh
Department, University & Country	All India Institute of Medical Sciences, India