Reviewer’s report

Title: Revision surgery for instrumentation failure after total en bloc spondylectomy: a retrospective case series

Version: 0 Date: 16 Jun 2020

Reviewer's report:

Manuscript Entitled "Revision surgery for instrumentation failure after total en bloc spondylectomy: a retrospective case series"

This retrospective study analysed the outcome after Enbloc spondylectomy (TES) in terms of implant failure and the revision strategies. The 61 patients underwent TES, 26 (42.6%) had instrumentation failure at an average of 32 months after TES and 23 patients underwent revision surgery.

The overall manuscript was well described. However, some suggestions should be addressed to improved information to readers.

1. The authors did not evaluate the risk factors of implant failure in this present study for example; Type of tumor, radiotherapy, level of the TES, the extensive of the resection, cage diameter, construction stiffness, etc. This information may suggest readers to select the proper reconstruction in TES procedure.

2. How did the authors design the reconstruction method in revision surgery?
   a. The authors did not extend the instrumentation in every revision case. What was the reason behind?
      b. When the author used 3 or 4 rods?
      c. What was the reason why the titanium rod was still used in some cases?

3. The author stated that one of the major factors that increased the rate of failure after TES was recycling frozen graft. If the authors still use this method (recycling frozen graft), how could the authors prevent instrumentation failure based on the success after revision strategies? Is it possible to Increase the number of rods in the first TES surgery? Lay the autograft around the cage? etc.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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