

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75996
Title of the Manuscript:	MORPHOMETRIC CT BASED ANALYSIS OF CERVICAL PEDICLE AND FACET JOINTS IN SOUTH INDIAN POPULATION
Type of the 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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>The study is relevant since technology should be applied to improve effective diagnostic and treatment outcomes and avoid harm to the patient.</p> <p>I want to give some suggestions for improving scientific writing based on the STROBE checklist.</p> <p>1. Text in general:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I suggest that authors review the text concerning words written together - without space. For example: jointsb (abstract); Introduction:Morphologically,the; prominenshas; nerves.In;ofChanplakorn et al, Rao et al,the; - Some sentences are missing the Definite article 'THE'. For example: The cervical spine; The curvature of the cervical spine; - Review the paragraphs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In the introduction: the first and second paragraphs are too long. And in the third paragraph, the sentence is too long. o In Result and Analysis: the third paragraph is too long. - Also, in RESULTS, write the results with the verb in the past tense rather than in the present tense. <p>2.Title:MORPHOMETRIC CT BASED ANALYSIS OF CERVICAL PEDICLE AND FACET JOINTS IN SOUTH INDIAN POPULATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I suggest you write CT in full in the title: MORPHOMETRICCOMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY-BASED ANALYSIS OF CERVICAL PEDICLE AND FACET JOINTS IN SOUTH INDIAN POPULATION <p>3. Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodology:the number 25 must be written in the RESULTS. In Method must be written the study population and the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Suggestion:A retrospective cross-sectional study was carried out among patients undergoing CT study of the cervical spine at Saveetha Medical College and Hospitals, Thandalam. Various measurements of the cervical pedicles and cervical facet joints were obtained and analysed as mean, standard deviation, and range using Statistical Package for the Social Sciencessoftware. - Results: Write the results with the verb in the past tense rather than in the present tense. For instance: using "was" instead of "is". - Conclusion:My opinion is that it is not possible to conclude the study helps the 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>surgeon. Suggestion: write the conclusion based on the results and the study objectives.</p> <p>4.Introduction: 2nd paragraph: The phrase “<i>But with its higher productivity</i>” is unclear why higher productivity carries a grave threat.</p> <p>5.Methodology: I would like to give some suggestions based on the STROBE checklist for cross-sectional study: - “A cross-sectional retrospective study was carried out among patients” (number the patients must be described in RESULTS) - What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study? - What was the period that the CT scans were performed?What was the period of data collection? - When was the study performed? - Could the authors specify the type of CT equipment? Could you describe the methodology or procedures used for carrying out the measurements?</p> <p>6. Results: -To write the results with the verb in the past tense rather than in the present tense. -Table: I suggest inserting the meaning of abbreviations used as a footnote to the table.</p> <p>7. Conclusion: Write the conclusion based on the results and the study objectives.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Julia Y Kawagoe
Department, University & Country	Albert Einstein Israelite Hospital (SP), Brazil