



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_47729
Title of the Manuscript:	C677T METHYLENETETRAHYDROFOLATE REDUCTASE HOMOZYGOSIS AND VITAMIN SUPPLEMENT IN MIGRAINEUR CHILDREN
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	<p>Methods: The sentences "The sample of study consists of 236 patients, 121 females and 115 males, aged between 8 to 13 years. We considered 148 Migraineurs." Include results from this research. They do not belong to methods section.</p> <p>Results: Table I: I believe that age was described in years, but this must be explained.</p> <p>Table I and Figure I: The frequency criteria must be explained (was the frequency daily? Weekly? Monthly?).</p> <p>Figure 5: Graphic must be better edited. Variable on the vertical axis must be explained. Also, its measure unit is lacking.</p> <p>Discussion: I strongly suggest that Authors describe the strong and weak points of their research, as well as the probability for generalization of their results.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction: review the exact number on the sentence: "The data of Italy population show mutation in homozygous in 8, 8-10% of people [26]." I believe that the correct number is "8.8 – 10%". The same is true for the third discussion sentence: "The data of Italy population show mutation in homozygous in 8,8-10% of people [26]",</p> <p>Introduction: Acronym MA was previously explained: "Many authors have demonstrated that the Migraine with and without aura (MA and MwoA) have many diagnostic characteristics in common but in children aren't studies controlled of large study samples".</p> <p>Methods: "The children are born in Italy from Italian parents Italians".</p> <p>Methods: "In 20 children suffer from MwoA and 11 from MA with hyperHcyA (>95° percentile for age) (...)"</p> <p>Results: Acronyms were previously coded "96 patients are suffering from Migraine without Aura (MwoA), 39 from Migraine with aura (MA), 13 from chronic migraine".</p> <p>Figure 4: measure unit must be specified.</p> <p>Results: "Values are grouped according to the age of the children (> or < 10 years)."</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fernando Gustavo Stelzer
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Ciencias da Saude de Porto Alegre, Brazil