



Peer review report

Peer review report 2 on “Percutaneous endoscopic lumbar discectomy for recurrent lumbar disc herniation”

**1. Original submission**

*1.1. Recommendation*

Major Revision.

*1.2. Comments to the author*

This is a well-written meta-analysis about PELD for rLDH. Use of English language, study design, and the methodology are the strengths of the study. Sample size and quality heterogeneity of the studies are the major limitations.

Abstract:

OK.

Introduction:

You should simplify the introduction; third paragraph should be stated in discussion.

Purpose of the review should be described in a better way, without questions. Additionally, you should dictate your hypothesis.

Methods:

Well designed methodology. Need some minor corrections;

You should remove the name of the authors in selection of studies section, you should write the initials of the authors.

You should correct examination to examination in selection of

studies section.

Results:

You should restructure results with removing some paragraphs and state in discussion. Results should include only the results of the study.

Discussion:

It is very good to start a brief paragraph about the study. Discussion flows smoothly. Limitations paragraph was designed well.

Conclusion:

OK.

References:

OK.

Tables and Figures:

In my opinion, there were too many figures and tables. Should be simplified and some figures especially describing subgroup analyses could be removed and dictated in results.

Mehmet Erdil, MD, Assoc.Prof.  
Istanbul Medipol University, Orthopaedics & Traumatology Dep.,  
Medipol Universitesi, Bagcilar, Istanbul, Istanbul 34093 Turkey  
E-mail addresses: [drmehmeterdil@gmail.com](mailto:drmehmeterdil@gmail.com),  
[mehmeterdil@hotmail.com](mailto:mehmeterdil@hotmail.com).

Available online 29 January 2016