

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_112820
Title of the Manuscript:	Folic acid protection in congenital neural tube defects: A narrative review
Type of the Article	Review Article

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a plethora of data to support the critical role of folic acid during pregnancy relative to the formation of the baby's neural tube. This study serves to confirm this concept. 2. The title is suitable 3. The abstract is comprehensive enough 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. The manual appears to be scientifically correct 6. The references are recent and since many of them refer to reviews of other bodies of work so they are sufficient 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While an optimal dose of folic acid for pregnant women and a corresponding interval dose has not been established, this narrative review could have further added to the body of research by mentioning the range of this nutrient, gleaned from the many studies. 2. The last paragraph of the discussion is unclear. It appears that a "not" is missing. "The controversy is based on the fact that food fortification policies with folic acid have been implemented in many countries¹², however, a drastic reduction in NTDs has, " NOT " been observed in countries that have implemented food fortification with folic acid²⁰ . 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Goulda Downer
Department, University & Country	College of Medicine, Howard University, U.S.A