



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_46665
Title of the Manuscript:	Perceptual judgments of logical propositions
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Fig. 5C), page 9 is highlighted for some reasons, maybe you would like to check it because there is no figure 5 C in the manuscript.</p> <p>Headings are sometimes ended with dots and sometimes without, maybe you would like to unify this.</p> <p>I do not see limitations of the study described in the 'conclusions' section or any other section of the manuscript. I think they should be discussed.</p> <p>I think the 'conclusions' section should be expanded about suggestions of future research in the field, unless the presented study is exhaustive in its findings and there is nothing else to be explored.</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	Yes. People were a subject of experiment. However, all authors declare that 'written informed consent was obtained from the patient (or other approved parties) for publication of this case report and accompanying images. A copy of the written consent is available for review by the Editorial office/Chief Editor/Editorial Board members of this journal.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	It is also declared by all authors that all experiments have been examined and approved by the appropriate ethics committee and have therefore been performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki	
--	--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Pawel Tadeusz Kazibudzki</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>The University in Czestochowa, Poland</i>