

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 26817

Title: Spinal Gout: A review with case illustration

Reviewer's code: 00505817

Reviewer's country: Qatar

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-28 14:42

Date reviewed: 2016-05-08 18:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your comments. All have been addressed and the changes are all underlined in the manuscript.

The manuscript has to have major revision taking in consideration all the following comments:

1-In page 4 , under Literature Review “ 54 peer reviewed articles met the Criteria... ” it should be clear what are the criteria used to include or exclude any publication.

- Page 4, under Literature review “Articles kept for review included patients who underwent treatment for spinal gout. Furthermore, data required for inclusion in the study included: patient demographics, clinical presentation, laboratory findings, imaging studies, and treatment methods were collected (Table 1). Articles excluded from the study were those that did not have patients diagnosed with spinal gout and those that did not include patient demographics, clinical presentation, laboratory findings, imaging studies, and treatment methods. After review, a total of 54 peer reviewed articles met the above criteria and were

included for data collection.

2-Under the results: It is not mentioned how many of those patients were known to have peripheral Gout before the onset of symptoms that led to the diagnosis of spinal gout.

- Now included in this section: " 41(60.3%) had prior history of peripheral gout."

3-Also it should be mentioned how was the diagnosis of spinal gout was made in those 68 patients (by aspiration , during surgery or based on MRI findings) because some patients were treated medically with surgical intervention.

- The authors have reviewed the 68 cases and found that all cases followed the current clinical standard for diagnosis of gout, even in patients with established history of gout. Laboratory tests and imaging were the initial diagnostic tools used. The imaging findings were subsequently confirmed with histologic confirmation of MSU crystal presence. All of the 68 cases had MRI scans which showed variable findings. With exception of two cases (2.9%), the laboratory and imaging findings were confirmed with histology. In the 66.2% of cases that had surgical intervention, the specimens were collected during surgery and retrospectively confirmed. Of the 29.4% patients who did not have surgical treatment, specimens were collected with fluid aspiration, CT or fluoroscope-guided.

4-In page 5 under laboratory Studies : 45(66.2% with elevated uric acid , it is very important to how many of the 68 patients were on uric acid lowering drugs because this could be the cause of normal uric acid in the remaining 33.8% of patients

- While most case reports did not specifically mention the treatment regimen after discharge, the reported uric acid levels were at the time of diagnosis which were not affected by the initiation of antiurate medications after discharge from the hospital.
- This information was not readily available from the selected articles. This will be listed as a limitation of the study.
- Included in the Discussion, Page 9-10, "Although this article provides a broad overview of cases involving spinal gout since January 2000, there are some limitations. The absence of certain information, such as the post-treatment outcomes, limited the depth of our analysis in certain cases. Furthermore, the literature review could not always account for individual variation among the 68 cases reviewed including the particular method of diagnosis, which was not standardized across all patients included in the study. In addition, the individual articles did not provide information regarding prior uric acid lowering treatments, which could possibly inflate the number of spinal gout cases with normal uric acid levels."

5-In page 6 under Case illustration in the second line of the last paragraph it is mentioned that "osseous erosive changes at the 3rd finger " . In fact in the x-rays it is the 4th finger DIP.

- Changes were made to reflect that it was indeed the 4th finger DIP involved.

6-In the abstract under results it is mentioned “ the most common surgical treatment performed was laminectomy in 35.3% “ while in page 6 under Treatment it is mentioned “ Thirty five (51.5%) patients had laminectomy .

- The abstract was updated to reflect the proper figures of 35(51.5%) based on data from Table 1

7- Under Treatments: adding all the % of patients who underwent different surgeries is not 100%, please explain. Page 6 Forty-five (66.2%) patients had surgical treatment, twenty (29.4%) received medical treatment alone and 3 (4.4%) did not report any treatment, now included, which will add up to 100%.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 26817

Title: Spinal Gout: A review with case illustration

Reviewer's code: 00631847

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-28 14:42

Date reviewed: 2016-06-04 11:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a good review concerning the spinal gout consisting of the symptom and signs, treatment option and lab data analysis. The authors also demonstrated a case report of spinal gout treated by surgery. This paper should be published.