

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3641
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Why Do Physicians Diagnose Gout in Young Adults with Perfect Kidney Function!!</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Book chapter</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	By emphasizing the potential misdiagnosis of hyperuricemia as pre-gouty illness, the study challenges traditional diagnostic and treatment paradigms, promoting a more nuanced approach. The innovative exploration of H. pylori's role in hyperuricemia and associated comorbidities like hypertension and diabetes expands the understanding of its systemic impact. While the manuscript is thought-provoking, its scientific rigor would benefit from improved organization, clearer methodology, and stronger evidence to support its claims.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title is informative but slightly verbose and may benefit from simplification. A more concise and engaging alternative could be: "Helicobacter pylori and Hyperuricemia: Revisiting Gout Diagnosis in Young Adults with Normal Renal Function"	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract provides a good summary of the study's aim and findings but can be improved for clarity, conciseness, and comprehensiveness. <b>Additions</b> Briefly mention the study design and key methodologies, such as the use of H. pylori fecal antigen tests and the colon-clearing therapy, to provide a clearer picture of how the results were obtained. Highlight the most significant results, such as the percentage of patients who achieved normal uric acid levels and the observed improvements in comorbidities. Add a sentence about how these findings could influence diagnostic guidelines or clinical practices. <b>Deletions</b> Remove redundant phrases, such as overly detailed explanations of gout's history or hyperuricemia's risks, as these are better suited for the introduction. Replace complex sentences like "patients hesitate to accept the decision of their pre-gouty illness..." with "patients often resist a gout diagnosis when renal function is normal."	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The results section effectively describes findings but could be better organized using subsections like " <b>Baseline Characteristics</b> ," " <b>Primary Outcomes</b> ," and " <b>Secondary Outcomes</b> ." Tables or figures could also help present results more succinctly. The discussion is thorough but overly verbose. Focus on interpreting results in the context of existing literature and highlight clinical implications. Use subsections like " <b>Key Findings</b> ," " <b>Comparison with Previous Studies</b> ," and " <b>Study Limitations</b> ." Consider adding visual elements like a flowchart of the study design, a table summarizing patient characteristics, or graphs showing uric acid level changes over time.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4</b>	The long-term follow-up of patients and the correlation between improved comorbidities and H. pylori eradication further reinforce the scientific validity of the findings. However, while the results are promising, the study would benefit from more detailed statistical analyses and larger sample sizes to ensure generalizability and technical soundness.	

[Review Form2](#)

<b>sentences may be required for this part.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Several cited studies lack clear citation details (references numbered as [11, 12]) and may not represent the most recent advances in the field.	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b> <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language quality of the article is generally understandable but requires some refinement to meet the standards expected in scholarly communications. Terms like "hyperuricemia" and "hyperuricema" should be used consistently. Choose one term and stick with it throughout the manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Some limitations need to be acknowledged in more detail. For instance, the sample size is relatively small (33 patients). Additionally, there is limited explanation of the statistical methods used to analyze the results, which should be clarified to ensure transparency and robustness of the findings. By addressing the potential role of H. pylori and proposing alternative therapies, the manuscript could influence clinical guidelines or practices related to gout diagnosis and treatment. It would be helpful to emphasize these clinical implications further in the discussion.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Saeid Amiri Zadeh Fard</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>