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Reviewer's report:

I enjoyed to read the article titled as Clinical effect analysis and radiographic outcomes of Isobar TTL system for two segmental lumbar degenerative disease: a retrospective study.

The condition of patients should be same to be compared with each other. The radiological characteristics in both groups did not described in the table 1. How did the author decide surgical technique?

What was the indication of 2 levels fusion? Did the patients have instability? What made the surgeon to go to between TTL dynamic stabilization and rigid stabilization?

When I calculated p value from table 5, p value was 0.67. There was no statistical difference in proximal adjacent segment disease.

How did the author dichotomize Pfirrmann (Prirrmann was wrong) grade and UCLA system?

What would be a reason for a less excellent or good result after rigid fusion?

One shortcoming of Isobar system may be a less lumbar lordosis that was shown in the author's cases. This issue needs to be discussed in the discussion section.

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.

No

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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