

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78086
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation of chronic back pain and heperuricemia, our hospital experience.
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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>It is written in a clear and concise language. In general, it is sufficient to control only punctuation marks throughout the text.</p> <p>It was not specified whether ethical approval was obtained or not. Please specify at the beginning of the method section (with ethics number and institution name)</p>																															
Minor REVISION comments	<p>It is also necessary to present the table associated with joint pain in people without hyperuricemia in Table 4.</p> <p>Table 4a: Radiological finding in patients with hyperuricemia</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="890 798 1573 1102"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Radiological Finding</i></th> <th><i>Frequency</i></th> <th><i>Percentage</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Joint pain</i></td> <td>19</td> <td>86.36</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Lumber disc prolapse</i></td> <td>16</td> <td>72.72</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Disc space narrowing</i></td> <td>21</td> <td>95.45</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Disc Degeneration</i></td> <td>12</td> <td>54.54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table 4b: Radiological finding in patients with no-hyperuricemia</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="890 1134 1573 1470"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>Radiological Finding</i></th> <th><i>Frequency</i></th> <th><i>Percentage</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Joint pain</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Lumber disc prolapse</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Disc space narrowing</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Disc Degeneration</i></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Radiological Finding</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Joint pain</i>	19	86.36	<i>Lumber disc prolapse</i>	16	72.72	<i>Disc space narrowing</i>	21	95.45	<i>Disc Degeneration</i>	12	54.54	<i>Radiological Finding</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Joint pain</i>			<i>Lumber disc prolapse</i>			<i>Disc space narrowing</i>			<i>Disc Degeneration</i>			
<i>Radiological Finding</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>																														
<i>Joint pain</i>	19	86.36																														
<i>Lumber disc prolapse</i>	16	72.72																														
<i>Disc space narrowing</i>	21	95.45																														
<i>Disc Degeneration</i>	12	54.54																														
<i>Radiological Finding</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>																														
<i>Joint pain</i>																																
<i>Lumber disc prolapse</i>																																
<i>Disc space narrowing</i>																																
<i>Disc Degeneration</i>																																
Optional/General comments	<p>Post-hoc power calculation of the study and presenting it in the article will make the article more valuable. If at least 80% power is not achieved, increasing the number of samples would be an appropriate approach. I leave that decision up to the authors.</p>																															

[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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>It was not specified whether ethical approval was obtained or not. Please specify at the beginning of the method section (with ethics number and institution name)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Meltem Koç
Department, University & Country	Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Turkey