

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_99542
Title of the Manuscript:	Association Between Age Gain, Parkinsonism and Pesticides: A Public Health Problem?
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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><i>YES, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The contamination with pesticides may provoke numerous serious public health problems. The current article emphasizes neurotoxicity, especially in older adults; and the consecutive increase in degenerative Parkinsonism, and cognitive disorders, including dementia.</i></p> <p><i>The title is OK.</i></p> <p><i>The abstract is comprehensive and summarizes the contents of the full text.</i></p> <p><i>The structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>The neurological part of the manuscript is scientifically correct. I can't be sure about the names of the pesticides (marked in blue). The mechanism of toxicity of organophosphates is OK.</i></p> <p><i>References are sufficient. A total of 243 sources of the last 5 years are analyzed.</i></p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p><i>I made some corrections and I marked (in red and yellow) some parts of the text. The words, marked in yellow, must be considered.</i></p>	
Optional/General comments	<p><i>I strongly recommend the publication of the manuscript with minor corrections. I strongly recommend the publication of the manuscript with minor corrections. I marked in yellow some parts of the text, which need attention.</i></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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ivet Borissova Koleva
Department, University & Country	University of Sofia, Bulgaria