

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_106107
Title of the Manuscript:	The Improvement of Back Pain and Radicular Pain Following Endoscopic Versus Microscopic Lumbar Discectomy: A Tertiary Care Center Experience in Egypt
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. In the introduction, the scientific background and rationale for the investigation were not reported. Authors mentioned that more studies with RCT designs are needed, but this work is a cross-sectional design. The necessity and rationale of this study is not clear for reader. Introduction should be revised.</p> <p>2. No. Title should Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term</p> <p>3. No</p> <p>4. No, the method section was written very poor: eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants should be clearly explained. How the study size was arrived should be described. Also, for each variable of interest, give sources of data, and details of methods of assessment and statistical methods should be written completely. Why confounding factors were not mentioned and controlled? Please explain variables, their statistical analyses and results according to study aims clearly. Discussion requires significant revision in regards to composition and structure. The section of discussion is very long and diffused. It is suggested that focus on obtained results and previous related studies. Please give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence. Avoid mentioning unnecessary contents so that the reader is not confused.</p> <p>5. it is appear that this work has not enough novelty and there are similar studies such as: Comparison of microendoscopic discectomy and open discectomy for single-segment lumbar disc herniation</p> <p>Percutaneous Endoscopic Lumbar Discectomy Versus Microdiscectomy for the Treatment of Lumbar Disc Herniation: Pain, Disability, and Complication Rate—A Randomized Clinical Trial</p> <p>6. The most of references were old. New references should be mentioned.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are a lot of grammatical errors in the manuscript, I thus suggest reviewing the manuscript by an external reader</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tayebah Roghani
Department, University & Country	Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Iran