

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_101520
Title of the Manuscript:	Functional Brain Network Connectivity Changes In Children and Adolescents With Attention- Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: A Resting-State Brain Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Study
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is important for scientific community, in particular the results of imaging investigations, which show significant differences between children with ADHD and typically developed normal health control subjects.</p> <p>No, I would put also a sentence referring to the epidemiological data comparing the children with ADHD and the normal controls.</p> <p>No, the results of the imaging investigations are not included and the same is missing from the conclusions. Yes.</p> <p>I would expect images with respect to the differences of the two groups in the specific examinations in the fMRI.</p> <p>There could be more references, when the results of the imaging investigations would be also included in the discussion session.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Apart from a few orthographic mistakes, I am satisfied with the level of the English language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dimitrios N. Kanakis
Department, University & Country	University of Nicosia Medical School, Cyprus