

**Paper: “Magnetic Resonance Imaging Findings in Patients with Low Back Pains and its Associations with Demographic Variables and Body Mass Index in Onitsha Nigeria”**

**Submitted: 14 April 2022**

**Accepted: 23 July 2022**

**Published: 31 July 2022**

Corresponding Author: Michael Promise Ogolodom

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n24p21

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Stankovska Gordana  
University of Tetova, Republic of Macedonia

-----  
Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is almost clear.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes, the abstract condensate all the objects, methodology frameworks and main results.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

I encourage an in-depth final reading before a possible publication.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Before addressing the methodology. I would like to spend some words on the introduction. References are not updated and the literature review may be not fully representative. See for instance:

[https://dx.doi.org/10.4103%2Fjfmmpc.jfmmpc\\_721\\_19](https://dx.doi.org/10.4103%2Fjfmmpc.jfmmpc_721_19)

<https://doi.org/10.1080/2374068X.2021.1948699>

and many others. Your results must then be discussed considering an updated literature review. Otherwise, the paper may be not fully transparent and representative.

The methodology is interesting and well-written.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Results are interesting but not all the tables are fully described.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Conclusions are undeveloped. Particularly, the authors do not indicate the theoretical and practical implications of their paper. Additionally, nothing is mentioned in terms of limitations and future research opportunities.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

No. References must be improved.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Dear Author(s),

The paper is interesting, but it seems to be in the initial phase. Please, follow and further the analysis by considering more updated references. Additionally, follow the previous suggestions.

All the best

The Reviewer

-----  
Reviewer K:

Recommendation: See Comments  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is not completely clear and adequate to the content of the article.

From anthropometry authors use only weight and height of a person to calculate BMI. Other anthropometric data, like body circumferences (waist, hip, limbs), indicated for assessment of adiposity are not used by the authors. Hence, the term ANTHROPOMETRY variables in the title does not fully correspond with the content of the article.

Therefore, title is grammatically incorrect.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Abstract is written clearly.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The article has grammatical errors.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The chapter material and methods is written clearly.

Therefore, 1. Authors do not mention about the history of a patient. It is worth to mention if a patient had history of trauma, oncological diseases, rheumatic diseases etc. 2. There is not indicated exclusion criteria; 3. It is recommended to indicate duration, lateralization, severity and irradiation of low back pain. Because all the type of low back pain can not be considered as similar entity.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body of the paper needs more detailed information; i.e. aim needs more concretization, results and discussion more information and precise data. It is strange, that metastasis, degenerative disc disease, osteoporosis, spondylosis etc are considered as similar entities, without paying attention on history, clinical manifestations, previous treatment, etc.

Introduction:

1. In the introduction the sentence is contradictory "The global prevalence and YLD rates from LBP decreased slightly from 1990 to 2017, but the number of LBP sufferers and YLDs increased substantially"; Moreover, authors indicated reference "Hoy et al., 2012", which can not contain information from future years;
2. It is recommended to review indications and priorities of CT and MRI for patients with low back pain;

RESULTS :

3. "Out of 76 patients' MRI data included this study, the majority 42 (53.3%) were males when compared with their female counterpart 34 (44.7%)" - total percentage index of patients should be 100%, but authors have 98%;
4. In the chapter "Socio-demographic distribution of patients" it is recommended to give the average data (Mean  $\pm$  SD) of weight, BMI and age in all the patients' groups, because these are the main data for this study;
5. MRI findings are the key factors for this study; hence, more detailed description of MRI changes found in groups would be more interesting and necessary;
6. In the DISCUSSION sentence "The majority of the MRI cases were found in individual within the age bracket of 51-60 years of age with overall mean age of  $53.26 \pm 11.96$  years" should be checked for mean age validity.
7. What was the difference between this study and "Orege et al (2013) study"?
8. The sentence "LBP could be as a result of the normal aging process or is multifactorial" - needs reference. Especially, taken into account the study data, when prevalence of spinal damage decreased after 60 years old age;
9. How do the authors explain the findings "Number of cases increases as age increase until the age of 51-60 where the highest number cases is recorded, then it decreases as the age increases."
10. In discussion "MRI findings" are used in a vague way and imprecisely. More concretization is absolutely indicated.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Conclusion is very vague and obscure.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

In general used references are adequate. Therefore, the references N8, N9 are absolutely non-appropriate in the site, where they are indicated; The articles have nothing common with the sentences, where they are indicated as references. In the sentence "which predisposes them the etiologies of LBP (13). This finding is in harmony with the findings of the studies conducted by Ogolodom et al(2021a), Ogolodom et al (2021b)"... N13 reference can NOT be in a harmony with Ogolodom et al, because this is the same reference.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

-----