

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80166
Title of the Manuscript:	Delta Fixation for High-Grade Spondylolisthesis: An uncommon surgical technique and case report
Type of the Article	Case report

### **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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The abstract is one of the most important parts of a scientific article as it is the first contact with a publication of this type, so its function is to quickly, reliably, and accurately communicate its content. In the conclusions within the abstract of your manuscript, instead of mentioning what the reader will find in the full text, you say that: "...The advantages and disadvantages of this method versus conventional methods will be discussed."), you should specify what are your main findings have been. Furthermore, you report that you followed up, your patient for 6 months and that she suffers from postoperative persistent paresthesia, and however, I have not been able to find this data in the full text of your manuscript.</p> <p>At the end of your introduction, you explain that: "...In our case report, greater mechanical stability and fusion rate was achieved by posterior transdiscal (pediculobody) fixation supplemented by a superior level fusion by three-column stabilization along with rapidity and procedural simplicity. With this procedure, compared with interbody fusion approaches, it was found that there was less intraoperative time spent, less blood loss, and less perioperative anesthetic complications, with virtually equivalent postoperative outcomes."). I suggest that this information be transferred to the discussion or the conclusions.</p>	<p>All the comments by the reviewer have been agreed upon and necessary corrections have been done in the manuscript. Corrections have been marked in green highlights.  <b>We appreciate your valued inputs.</b></p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>In the journal's Author Guidelines, it's indicated that all references should follow the following style:</p> <p>Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.</p> <p>Please, note that the month and day aren't included, but if you will decide to add them which, in general, is also correct please, unific the format. Some references appear with the month and the day, while others only contain the month. That is to say: references 1; 3; 5; 7; 8 (2007 Mar;) (1979 Jun;), (2009 Jun;), (2017 Mar), (2009 Jun) and references 2; 4; 6; 9; 10 (2001 Sep 1;), (2003 Jun 1;), (2009 Jun 1), (2007 Sep 15), (1995 Jul 15).</p> <p>In addition, in references 5 and 8, you should unify the journal title and the punctuation for the supplement number, because, these are two papers in the same journal.</p> <p>In the journal's Author Guidelines you will also find the following notes:                      -Use of DOI number for the full-text article is encouraged. (if available).                      -Authors are also encouraged to add other database's unique identifier (like PUBMED ID).</p>	<p>All referencing in the manuscript has been done in standard Vancouver style referencing.</p> <p>All the comments by the reviewer have been agreed upon and necessary corrections have been done in the manuscript. Corrections have been marked in green highlights.                      We appreciate your valued inputs.</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Although it seems that this surgical procedure was proposed or published for the first time in 1994, by Abdu et al. (<a href="https://journals.lww.com/spinejournal/Abstract/1994/03001/Pedicular_Transvertebral_Screw_Fixation_of_the.11.aspx">https://journals.lww.com/spinejournal/Abstract/1994/03001/Pedicular_Transvertebral_Screw_Fixation_of_the.11.aspx</a>), I have done a PubMed simple search, and I have found very little bibliography on this particular subject, which makes their contribution especially important.</p> <p>In general, Your manuscript is clear and easy to read, furthermore, the case report section is very thorough and detailed, then, please, consider implementing the suggestions that I make.</p>	<p>All the comments by the reviewer have been agreed upon and necessary corrections have been done in the manuscript. Corrections have been marked in green highlights.                      We appreciate your valued inputs.</p>

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	