Reviewer's Comments on the Letter to the Editor entitled "Generalising the results: how can we improve our reports?" by Saltychev M, Eskola M (2018). *Eur Spine J*; doi:10.1007/s00586-018-5558-4

Kimberley L. Edwards¹

Received: 4 March 2018 / Accepted: 5 March 2018 / Published online: 17 April 2018
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2018

I completely agree regarding the use of 95% confidence interval and risk/odds ratios (use odds ratio if rare outcome/case-control study design rather than risk ratio—which the authors do not mention) to help describe the likely effect in a different sample. In addition, I frequently advise people about MCID and effect size not being the same as statistical significance. For example, who cares if surgery A is better than surgery B/conservative management/whatever

is statistically significantly different compared to the other one if the difference in (say) return to work was 1 day (e.g. 90 vs. 91 days).

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The author has no conflicts of interest.

✉ Kimberley L. Edwards
Kimberley.Edwards@nottingham.ac.uk

¹ Orthopaedics, Trauma and Sports Medicine, School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, W/C 1374 West Block, C Floor, Queen's Medical Centre, Nottingham NG7 2UH, UK