

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_82212
Title of the Manuscript:	Surgical Outcomes of Bone Cement Augmented Screw Fixation, Cannulated Screws and Vertebroplasty in Osteoporotic Spine
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The sample size as mentioned by authors was 30, but only 20 patients take part in research, what about the rest? 2- The manuscript need to be read by specialist in the related fields. 3- Many tables are not necessary (1-4-5-6). 4- In table3, percent for group with low patients seems to be invalid. 5- In table 6 two percent means $30 \times 0.02 = 0.6$ patients?! 6- In discussion it is not necessary to name the authors of researches and only the reference number are enough. 7- The manuscripts need to reorganized and revised. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is nothing about type, place, country and other information of the research. 2. The structure of the abstract needs revising. 3. What is DEXA scan? 4. In (patients & method) section there are many incomplete sentences (personal history etc.) 5. There are many figures and tables. 6. There are many unnecessary subtitle in method section. 	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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> The authors did not mention anything about the improvement of the research in ethical COMMITTEE.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Masoud Roudbari
Department, University & Country	Iran university of medical sciences, Iran