

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>	Revision amended																														
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><tr><th>Radiological Finding</th><th>Frequency</th><th>Percentage</th></tr><tr><td>Joint pain</td><td>19</td><td>86.36</td></tr><tr><td>Lumber disc prolapse</td><td>16</td><td>72.72</td></tr><tr><td>Disc space narrowing</td><td>21</td><td>95.45</td></tr><tr><td>Disc Degeneration</td><td>12</td><td>54.54</td></tr></table> <p>Table 4b: Radiological finding in patients with no-hyperuricemia</p> <table><tr><th>Radiological Finding</th><th>Frequency</th><th>Percentage</th></tr><tr><td>Joint pain</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Lumber disc prolapse</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Disc space narrowing</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Disc Degeneration</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Radiological Finding	Frequency	Percentage	Joint pain	19	86.36	Lumber disc prolapse	16	72.72	Disc space narrowing	21	95.45	Disc Degeneration	12	54.54	Radiological Finding	Frequency	Percentage	Joint pain			Lumber disc prolapse			Disc space narrowing			Disc Degeneration			Revision amended
Radiological Finding	Frequency	Percentage																														
Joint pain	19	86.36																														
Lumber disc prolapse	16	72.72																														
Disc space narrowing	21	95.45																														
Disc Degeneration	12	54.54																														
Radiological Finding	Frequency	Percentage																														
Joint pain																																
Lumber disc prolapse																																
Disc space narrowing																																
Disc Degeneration																																
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 <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> 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)	