



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_60204
Title of the Manuscript:	To be or not to be? What makes a child dyslexic. An overview on risk factors and correlated clinical aspects
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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. In heading 4 under maternal morbidities- "According to case-control studies, family history of abortion increases the probability of dyslexia, and the risk of miscarriage requiring hospitalization is higher in families with reading disorders compared to controls" This statement appears very vague and loose, it's useful to mention the name of the study and the finding to bring about some clarity</p> <p>2. In Heading 8 Visual perceptual factors- "In previous studies, we documented increased spatial relationship anisotropy in a class of dyslexic readers"-Does we refer to the authors? And references to the studies are missing in the line</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. There are a lot of details put in each section, it will be very useful for readers to understand if a summary is given about the important findings, at the end of each paragraph although I know a table is provided at the end</p> <p>2. It's also recommended to reduce the amount of details but rather focus on ones with more evidence in support of causation, since at present it's bit difficult for the reader to understand the degree of relevance of each causes</p> <p>3. The whole article, gives an impression of reading a textbook with a lot of information squeezed in. Although a review article is intended to explore in depth the possible correlations and causes, it's important to be reader friendly as well. It will be better to reorganise the paragraphs and reduce the details put in each sentences, especially in Heading 8.</p>	
Optional/General comments	The reader should be able to understand the main causes and degree of evidence base after reading a review article like this one. I do feel article covers it comprehensively and gives ample amount of details regarding the same but reader may find it an exhausting read because of the amount of information and the structuring of sentences	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manjunadh Muraleedharan Pillai
Department, University & Country	United Kingdom