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. It is a good comparative analysis paper with long-term follow-up result of sufficient patient group. Therefore, it is better to add this point to the title to differentiate it from previous papers. However, there have been a lot of papers comparing open surgery and PTED. Therefore, it is necessary to present different results from the previously published paper comparing open surgery and PTED.
. In addition, in practice, the recurrence rate after endoscopic lumbar discectomy is reported to be higher than the authors say, so it is necessary to accurately indicate how the recurrence was evaluated. It should be clarified whether routine MRI has been evaluated, including recurrence of mild symptoms, or only those patients who require surgical treatment due to complaints of severe symptoms should be clarified.
. English proofreading is required.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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

Yes

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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