

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78796
Title of the Manuscript:	Lumbar stenosis with necrosis of foot a diagnostic approach
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

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>In the manuscript titled "Lumbar stenosis with necrosis of foot a diagnostic approach" authors have tried to delineate the relationship between foot necrosis and lumbar stenosis. The idea of the manuscript is clinically relevant. However, the review was not conducted properly. My main concern is that the authors have not discussed the methodology for the review article. There are no details provided on how the search was conducted and on which platforms. The comprehensive details of methodology are essential to make sure that the authors conducted the review thoroughly. Besides this, the language in the manuscript is poor and needs to be reviewed by a native speaker. The grammar and sentence structure throughout the manuscript are not coherent. Along with that there are several spelling mistakes in the manuscript. Also, the authors have discussed influence of stenosis on foot necrosis very less. Foot necrosis is one of the essential elements of the authors manuscript, it needs to be discussed in more detail.</p> <p>Besides this, the treatments for spinal stenosis are discussed poorly. The references in the manuscript also need to be complete and formatted properly.</p> <p>The idea of the manuscript is good, but authors need to conduct a thorough literature review. The manuscript in its current form is not suitable for publication currently.</p> <p>The detailed comments are provided with the attached manuscript.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muzammil Mumtaz
Department, University & Country	The University of Toledo, USA