



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_53439
Title of the Manuscript:	Bertolotti's syndrome: An Underdiagnosed Cause of Lower Back Pain; A Case Report of Two Cases and Current Management Options
Type of the Article	Case report

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Poor English, the author should apply to professional interpreter. Some examples of mistakes:</p> <p>in which an abnormal enlargement of the transverse process of the fifth lumbar vertebra and is associated with lower back pain</p> <p>It is a syndrome that is not an uncommon</p> <p>and may articulate or fuse with the sacrum or ilium and producing a chronic, persistent low back pain</p> <p>and currently patient is otherwise well</p> <p>A diagnostic test that infiltrates the neoarticulation sacroiliac joint injection maybe attempted.</p> <p>minimally invasive resection of the LSTV be used</p> <p>should be considered as a differential diagnosis</p> <p>difference between the fusion or resection groups</p> <p>In light of the diversity of clinical presentation</p> <p>2. The author mentions pseudoarticular degeneration as the cause of the pain, but neither administered them chondroprotectors nor recommend these remedies in management of other patients.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Belenky Vadim</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Russia</i>