

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_88886
Title of the Manuscript:	Fusion Assessment in Stand Alone Oblique lumbar interbody fusion in Adult Degenerative Lumbar Scoliosis
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript need to be checked for the appropriate sentence formation, grammatical error and appropriate punctuations by an English expert. <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient: Here it is nothing but the reprint of the first paragraph of the report. - Abbreviations need expansion at their first appearance in the manuscript. - The abstract is a brief context of the manuscript. Need a brief background on what base this study has been planned. (statement in this abstract is not appropriate) Methods need to be a brief narrative of the procedure, how was it done. – Need revision <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction don't have any other significant clinical and statistical presentation to create a research problem statement for the research. Need to discuss on the current problem, issues which gives rise to the development if research questions for this study. Also there are no objectives or hypotheses are provided. Please review. This could serve better to understand the need and the relevance of the research report. <p>Patients and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The study design is not clearly stated - The research report need to explain who the subjects are, how the sampling was done. - How all the pre operative date were collected? - Who did the surgery? How often the follow ups were done? - Was there any consent attained from the participants? Was there any ethical committee clearance obtained for the study? - Need detailed explanation of clear step by step procedure ho the study was done. The methodology need to be re-written. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The discussion part depicts mostly the results and the current study results need to rationalized with previous evidences and the any possible similarities and dissimilarities need to be discussed with rationale behind that result. - Need discussion on possible physiological, anatomical, bio-mechanical and procedural reasons behind the status of the results need to be discussed with evidences to validate the results of this research and to increase the quality of the manuscript. - Need to refurbish the discussion. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The conclusion statements are not a counter productive of the above discussion. When any statements to be drafted as conclusion there should be strong supportive discussion to be provided. So that the conclusion statement could be validated. 	
Minor REVISION comments	The title need to be clear of stating the study design and core objective.	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karthikeyan G
Department, University & Country	USA