



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_24173
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiology of Low Back Pain in Saudi Arabia
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This review paper appears to have a good study design and execution. However, the paper is organized poorly and in a confusing fashion. Here are areas that would improve the organization. 1. Introduction should contain the general epidemiology about low back pain world wide. 2. Cite your sources with a superscript number, not name and year. 3. Focus studies on Saudi Arabia into a few categories. For example, studies related to occupation, studies related to diet, studies related to education, or something. 4. Have a key point or two for each of those categories. 5. Summarize these points in the conclusion. 6. Organize the information into proper paragraphs.	Dear Peer Reviewer: Thank you for your valuable comments, we have reviewed and modified the paper according to your comments. Done Done Done Done Done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This article contains good information scattered about. A major rewrite is required to organize the information into a clear, concise, and understandable paper. The research does not have to be repeated, and in fact looks good. But the paper is written poorly.	General Rearrangement done