



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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As your main aim of this paper is considering 'early diagnosis and treatment', it is better to differentiate pre-school factors (items 2-7) with the factors may identify dyslexia after school (such as item 8). 2. Based on my knowledge, comorbid psychiatric disorders may be consequence of dyslexia after school age (except ADHD) and have no primary role for dyslexia diagnosis and etiology. Then I recommend to address this issue through item 6 or delete the item 6 completely, if you agree. 3. In item 5, you can refer to some other factors such as: drug/alcohol/tobacco consumption during pregnancy to enrich your paper. 4. As you know, phonology is one of the language levels and it is better to change the item 7 to 'phonological and linguistic factors' as you addressed in table 1 properly. 5. It seems that the table 1 and its previous description should be separated from the item 8. 6. I have no idea about dyslexia as a 'neuropsychiatric condition' (as stated in conclusion-item 9). It is better to be changed as 'neurodevelopmental or neuropsychological' condition. 7. Only a typo has occurred: The spelling of 'habilitative' should be modified to 'rehabilitative'. 8. The sentence "the familiarity of the disorder is probably the main risk factors" in conclusion is not reasonable. I suppose that you wanted to address the <i>familial</i> nature of dyslexia and you wanted to type "familiality". If I am wrong, please correct me. 9. According to your manuscript, it seems that self-report inventories like AAP are only suitable to be used instead of some other psychological or educational teste at best. Therefore, they have no early diagnostic value. If I understand correctly, it should be said that too much emphasis has been placed on this inventory (AAP) in your manuscript that must be adjusted please. 	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mostafa Daemi
Department, University & Country	University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences, Iran