



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_49836
Title of the Manuscript:	The effects of oral contraceptives on nutrient status, with especial consideration to folate
Type of the 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a review and title should express this (this is a review), otherwise readers cannot understand that this is a review article. 2. Introduction: Please touch very shortly why OC affects nutrition. General statement is OK! 3. Sorry if I am absent-minded but I believe that there are no data that showed "NTD occurred more frequently from women having taken (or just after) OC than those without OC". Therefore, whether FA replacement to OC users (many of whom do not become pregnant) actually reduce NTD, and if so, how many fraction of women (or NTD babies) may have been merited. State this somewhere. Your discussion and conclusion is based on speculation. 4. Minor comments: reference: pages are described in a style like both122-124 and 122-4, and with/without punctuation. Please be consistent. 	<p>This has been addressed in the title of the paper</p> <p>Please see the two sentences added to the introduction which hopefully addresses this issue</p> <p>Very good point. I have added 4 references and significantly extended this section of the discussion to hopefully address this issue.</p> <p>Amendments duly made as per the reference section</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	