Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_85519
Title of the Manuscript:	Gadolinium enhancement in cervical myelopathy: Case report of a surgically treated patient.
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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.journalijmpcr.com/index.php/IJMPCR/editorial-policy)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

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	The author must correct, homogenize and use the same format in all the abbreviations used in the text. For example: MR vs MRI.	
	The term "spondylotic myelopathy" should be abbreviated along the text.	
Minor REVISION comments	ABSTRACT - Case description, line 11. Consider removing the abbreviation "RM". - Case description, line 13. Consider using the word "Gadolinium" instead of "Gd". INTRODUCTION - Line 33. Include the full description of the abbreviation "MRI".	
	- Line 33. Include the full description of the abbreviation links Line 34. weighted	
	CASE REPORT - Line 52. stabilization	
	DISCUSSION - Line 71. inflammatory	
	FIGURE 1 - Line 82. weighted - Line 83. image - Line 84. image	
Optional/General comments	Dear authors,	
	my sincere congratulations for an interesting "case study" regarding the role of Gadolinium enhancement in the cervical myelopathy. I have learnt and enjoyed a lot reading your manuscript. It is a high quality paper that deserves to be published after some minor corrections, which I propose above.	
	For an easy review, I recommend the authors adding the manuscript the number of the pages and a continuous number of lines.	

PART 2:

		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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rafael García-Cañas
Department, University & Country	Central Hospital Of Defence "Gómez Ulla", Spain

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)