



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_32962
Title of the Manuscript:	Rationale of Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids Supplementation in the Frame of the Magnocellular Theory of Dyslexia
Type of Article:	Minireview paper

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Certainly Livingstone et al. 1991 studied <i>post mortem</i> human material. And in their previous work they also studied monkeys brains. If no mention to human <i>postmortem</i> is done in this paper, no information is given concerning what are those numbers referring to and confusion might happen. Now is corrected. I do not know if Livingstone et al., should have given his/their permission to publish this numerical information of theirs, otherwise, some sort of plagiarism might be happening. Moreover, ethical information and declaration of Helsinki (DoH) with the ethical code is mandatory to mentioned every time now for human material explanations and publications. Because this paper is done over a work in 1991, and DoH was firstly adopted in 1964, the Helsinki Code should be mentioned for ethical considerations toward human patients who donor their brain cells for Scientific study.	The numerical information is reported at page 7944 of their paper, third line: ("we examined the LGN in autopsy specimens for five dyslexic subjects (four males and one female)[...] and five nondyslexic subjects (all males [...]). All of the dyslexic brains came from subjects who were diagnosed in life and had been used in previous anatomical studies". The number of observations has been reported at page 7946, Table I. I have clearly explained the experiment had been performed by the Boston researchers and not by me (this consideration now is embedded in the text). Since these data have been published, therefore they are made public, no permission is needed when the piece of information is reported with its reference. This is, indeed, what I have done, so in my opinion no plagiarism is recognizable. I think this issue had been considered by the Proc Natl Acad Sci Usa Editors when the paper was accepted for publication in 1991. However the paper of Livingstone et al that I cited in my manuscript simply processed data from specimens obtained in two previous experiments dating back 1985 and 1990: -Galaburda AM, Sherman GF, Rosen GD, MBiol FA, Geschwind N. Developmental dyslexia: Four consecutive patients with cortical anomalies. (1985). Ann Neurol, 18: 223-233. -Humphreys P, Kaufmann WE, Galaburda AM. (1990). Developmental dyslexia in women: Neuropathological findings in three patients. Ann neurol, 28: 727-738.