

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_90941
Title of the Manuscript:	Magnetic Resonance Myelography in Diagnosis of Chronic Low Back pain
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The article should be edited in terms of English language. There are various mistakes. There is an error in the design of the study. The activity of the conventional MR and MR myelography was compared, but there are many biases. First of all, there is no statistical difference between the two groups as a result of the study. Therefore, it is not right to comment that MRM is significantly superior. Are Conventional MR and MRM evaluated by the same observer? If so, it should be specified in the text. It would be more appropriate to make evaluations by different observers and analyse the intra-observer and inter-observer differences. Please do not repeat the findings which has been already written in the text, in the table. The data that should be included in the introduction is also given in the discussion section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	In my opinion, if the objective data, including the clinical findings of the patients, and the points that MRM was superior to the conventional MRI was written as case series, this article would be much more valuable. The images in the cases presented are very nice. The case series in which these images were used would be very good. I have included some arguments that can set an example for the authors below. Some examples; Surgery was decided as a result of MRM, while surgical indication was not considered with the Conventional MRI for the case. For the case, the patient's clinical findings could not be explained by conventional MRI, while MRM could explain the clinical and physical examination findings of the patient. Or; A pathology that could not be noticed in conventional MRI was detected in MRM.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ilker Ilhani
Department, University & Country	Ondokuz Mayıs University School of Medicine, Türkiye