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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting study that supports a more conservative thinking in degenerative lumbar spine disease. It is becoming increasingly clear that this group of patients is at high risk of complications and re-interventions after major spine surgery. I commend the long follow up despite some methodological shortcomings that are inherent to this type of retrospective research, but the findings are valuable and in my mind worthy of publication as an addition to the ongoing and necessary discussion on how to best treat this group of patients. The authors address the shortcomings in an adequate manner.

I would change the term 'passed away' (118, 149, 253) for 'died. Furthermore, in the discussion I would mention that for these elderly patients, maybe a short term benefit may be more important than the ultimate long term result, as a 'regression to the mean' probably occurs with aging.

Other than that, despite the loss to follow up and the likelihood of surgeon's bias, a valuable article, compliments.
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