

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_82083
Title of the Manuscript:	Are osteoid osteoma and ankylosing spondylitis in some way linked? A case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to read and review this manuscript. There is some general concern about the methodology of work.</p> <p>Keywords: I suggest changing the keyword: "ankylosing spondylitis". It is already present in the title.</p> <p>Abstract: It is not clear which outcome measure was used to assess the pain (or function) of the patient. Please add.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction: Add reference: To the best of our knowledge, only two case reports of bilateral sacroiliitis in association with osteoid osteoma have been reported</p> <p>What was the outcome measure adopted to decide the surgery (e.g. "Giving the severity of the pain interfering with the patient's daily life", please add the validated outcome used)</p> <p>It is not clear what happened from the first consultation (2 years back) and the decision of the surgery. It was considered as a first choice the conservative treatment? If yes, what was the treatment? Dosage, etc.</p> <p>I suggest adding the timeline relevant to the case study and the patient's perspective.</p> <p>I suggest declaring the limits of the case report.</p> <p>Patient consent: having it orally is not enough, in my opinion. What about the Ethics Committee approval?</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Francesca Bonetti
Department, University & Country	Tor Vergata University of Rome, Italy