

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_101302
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio-Demographic and Clinical Profile of Neurological Movement Disorders Patients: A Tertiary Care Hospital Study in Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalajorin.com/index.php/AJORRIN/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. It unveils profile of patients with movement disorders in Bangladesh.</p> <p>2. The title of the article suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is not scientifically correct, the authors should conduct the equivalent research in the group of comparison.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language/English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communications.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Belenky Vadim
Department, University & Country	Russia