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| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | There are many problems with this manuscript, which are now detailed.  
First, the manuscript is full of writing errors in syntax, sentence structure, punctuation, etc. This makes it very difficult to read the manuscript. Thus, the manuscript would require very extensive editing in order to improve its readability.  
Second, there is an error of organization in the manuscript. Specifically, the herniated disc (covered in sub-section 5.1) is not an influencing factor in the etiology of degenerative disc disease (DDD). Rather, the herniated disc is a separate phenomenon, which is only related to DDD in that both have been implicated as leading to or involved in low back pain.  
Third, the authors did not cite and discuss many articles in the literature on DDD (including some impressive review articles) that are germane to all the aspects covered in the manuscript. Here are 10 examples of these articles:  
Zhang Y, et al., Advances in |

Fourth, and most importantly, there is a very large body of literature on DDD, yielding a rich trove of information on myriad aspects of this topic. Thus, in attempting to write a succinct review article on DDD, the authors set themselves an unenviable task. Unfortunately, in this review, the authors have not added anything new or insightful to the literature. The authors could have achieved this had they focused on the following aspects: 1) gaps in the literature; 2) controversies in the literature; 3) state-of-the-art treatment modalities, such as gene therapy and disc transplantation; and 4) suggestions for future research that address items (1) and (2).
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