



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The revised manuscript corrected some problems, but still has many errors (please see the list below). The authors still did not describe the study as a prospective or retrospective study. The authors still did not discuss the limitations of their study. The authors did not try to make the manuscript more interesting by adding a figure to show a sample of blink reflex in a GBS patient and a control.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract result: "amplitude(A)" Should delete (A) because "A" was not use in the abstract later. Abstract result: Should not use a numerical number at the beginning of the sentence, such as "3 patients had" and "2 patients had". Abstract result: F wave "in 2 cases it was decreased" Do you mean prolonged F wave latency, or reduce F wave amplitude? Abstract Conclusion: "Blink reflex" and "Blink Reflex" should all change to blink reflex. INTRODUCTION, line 23: "compound nerve action potentials". It should be compound muscle action potentials (CMAP). INTRODUCTION, line 33: "Its alteration were", Grammatical error. MATERIAL AND METHODS, line 44: "There was no issue of ethical committee approval during this study as the patients were referred to dept of Medicine of our institute." In neurophysiology laboratory, all studies were referred in clinical practice. However, for scientific research, all case controlled studies need institutional review board (IRB) approval. If it is a prospective study, participates need an informed consent. In retrospective study, a research study needs IRB approval to protect patients' privacy. All case controlled study need IRB approval in US. If there is no requirement for this type study in India, please indicate it. RESULTS, line 82, 89, 94, 98: should delete "1" in each paragraph because you do not have list 2 or other. RESULTS, line 94: "Decreased sensory conduction velocity (SCV) was seen in 5 patients." What nerve? ETHICAL APPROVAL line 161: "There was no issue of Ethical Committee approval" See above as line 44. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> "A" deleted in abstract as suggested Numerical values 2 & 3 replaced with two and three in abstract as suggested As corrected, it means prolonged F wave latency Blink reflex changed to blink reflex Compound nerve action potential changed to compound muscle action potential in line 23 as suggested Grammatical error in line 33 corrected Though as already mentioned before, IRB approval wasn't taken for the reasons specified. However, as the patients were admitted in the Department of Medicine, informed consent for the tests was taken in their admission files in the Medicine wards Deleted "1" from lines 82, 89, 94 & 98 as suggested Decreased sensory conduction velocity was seen in median & ulnar nerves. Added to text where suggested Answered in point 8.