

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** A randomized, controlled trial of spinal endoscopic adhesiolysis in chronic refractory low back and lower extremity pain

**Version:** 5 **Date:** 20 May 2005

**Reviewer:** Gerbrand Groen

### Reviewer's report:

General

-----  
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Although I do feel that unblinding to the statician only of the results of the 1st part of the RCT does have an impact on the view and knowledge of the investigators, this is no major objection to publish the RCT. The text can be accepted as is.

-----  
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The authors have responded adequately and adjusted the text accordingly. Furthermore the extensions in the paper have added to its clarity.

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The authors have sufficiently answered.

-----  
Level of interest

This Reviewer would categorize this RCT between 'An article of importance in its field' (which it is) and 'An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests'. The arguments for this categorization are that the earlier short-term results were already published previously. If this would have been the 1st report, the 1st category would have been advised.

**What next?:** Accept without revision

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests