



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_44318
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF BLINK REFLEX IN EARLY DIAGNOSIS OF CRANIAL NERVE NEUROPATHY IN GUILLAIN BARRE SYNDROME
Type of the Article	case control study

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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	Hospital name should be kept confidential.	Hospital name omitted as suggested
Minor REVISION comments	No.	
Optional/General comments	All patients should be of same age group to avoid any age influence on blink reflex.	All 5 patients were matched with 5 age and sexed matched controls. It isn't possible to have patients of similar ages as suggested as the patients were referred from department of Medicine to the department of Physiology as when they reported in the OPD. The patients were not chosen for this study.

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Although the author mentions that there was no need for consent I believe that consent is mandatory as their study results are being used.</p>	