

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77089

Title: Multiple tophus deposition over the spine: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06271151 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FACS, MD

Professional title: Academic Fellow, Research Fellow, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ecuador

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-21 02:52

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-27 03:46

Review time: 6 Days

| Scientific quality | [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish |
|--------------------|--|
| Language quality | [Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection |
| Re-review | [Y]Yes []No |
| Peer-reviewer | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous |



statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The clinical case described is very interesting.

Of unusual presentation but can have deleterious complications, as it is not diagnosed.

The title of the abstract as well as the description of the case and discussion are practical and clear.

I have no observations. no corrections. Congratulations

Answering reviewer:

Thank you very much!



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77089

Title: Multiple tophus deposition over the spine: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00505859 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-14

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-26 10:36

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-26 13:47

Review time: 3 Hours

| Scientific quality | [] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish |
|--------------------|--|
| Language quality | [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection |
| Re-review | [Y]Yes []No |
| Peer-reviewer | Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous |



statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is well written and there is no need to comment on individual sections.

That being said, grammar needs to be reviewed to assure complete sentences, the words "hawk" and "cervical medulla" need replacement amd benzbromarone should be deleted (as withdrawn due to hepatic effects in most countries).

The authors should comment on the risk of collapse from removal/dissolution of gouty tophi - that may be providing structural integrity.

Answering reviewer:

Thank you for your review on this article

I have followed your review and changed it as follows

the word "hawk" was replaced by "olecranon"

and the word "cervical medulla" was replaced by "the cervical spinal cord"

After detailed review of relevant literatures, the context about benzbromarone was deleted.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77089

Title: Multiple tophus deposition over the spine: a case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05850740 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-14

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-26 02:30

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-07 04:18

Review time: 12 Days and 1 Hour

| Scientific quality | [] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish |
|--------------------|--|
| Language quality | [] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection |
| Re-review | []Yes [Y]No |
| Peer-reviewer | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous |



statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- -The manuscript requires English language polishing
- -Please use generally accepted term when describing gout; 'gout stone' should be replaced with 'tophus' or 'tophi'
- -The conclusion (in both abstract and main text) did not make sense.

The case focuses mostly on surgical intervention of spinal gout. But the conclusion instead stated that pharmacological intervention (rather than surgical) is important to relieve neurological deficit.

-In the first paragraph of the discussion. The cause of gout described was wrong. Gout was not cause by decreased uric acid metabolism, nor impaired purine metabolism.

Answering reviewer:

The language of this manuscript has been re-edited.

All the words of 'gout stone' were replaced with 'tophus' or 'tophi'.

The conclusion has been changed to focus on surgical treatment as required.

The cause of gout described have been corrected in the discussion of the first paragraph.