

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_116095
Title of the Manuscript:	The Indiscriminate Use of Glyphosate Could Increase the Prevalence of Alzheimer's Disease? A Review
Type of the Article	Review

Review Form 1.7

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)	YES	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	Thank you for your comments! We followed all suggestions.
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors retrieved 35,590 publications from various Internet sources using the keywords; <i>Alzheimer's disease and pesticides</i>; <i>neurodegenerative diseases and pesticides</i>, of which, 35,531 were excluded as not meeting 2 criteria: publication in a journal with an impact factor below 4 and articles with duplicate content. The remaining 59 articles are presented in 2 groups: (1) with quantitative (23) and (2) with qualitative (36) results.</p> <p>Next comes a list of the titles of these 59 articles, pertaining either to the group quantity or quality, occupying 6 of the 14 pages of the entire text, while surprisingly, the same entire list of articles is repeated in the bibliography. As a result, 13 out of 21 pages of the work are occupied by article titles. The remaining 8 pages contain an abstract, two diagrams describing the procedure for obtaining article titles from the Internet without significant new information, and 6 pages of technical notes simply indicating the connection between pesticides and Alzheimer's disease. All of the above looks like a bibliographic reference on the specified topic, and not as a meaningful analysis of published information.</p> <p>Specific comments.</p> <p>1. The authors provide no reason to use only articles in journals with an impact factor above 4 as an inclusion criterion; There can be many different reasons for this, one of which is that publishing in high-impact journals is more expensive.</p> <p>2. As one can see below, the title, goals and two conclusions lack congruence, logic, scientific value, and it is generally impossible to understand what is being said.:</p> <p>Aims: This review aims to prospectively assess whether literature data can be used to inform society and specifically healthcare professionals about prevention and treatment precautions for individuals and animals exposed to glyphosate, including through dietary intake.</p> <p><u>Conclusions:</u></p>	<p>1. We explained the reasons and added some papers with impact factor minor than 4.</p> <p>2. Yes! Thank you for your comments. We simplified the goal of this work and change the texts about.</p> <p>3. We change the title and goals indicating more information about the pesticides in general than glyphosate, specifically.</p> <p>We believe that the changes in the manuscript answered the asked about generalization.</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<p>In the Abstract: There appears to be a relationship between the increase in pesticide use, particularly Glyphosate, and the rise in Alzheimer's disease prevalence.</p> <p>In the end of the text: it is compelling to indicate that there is at least a theoretical and qualitative relationship between the increase in pesticide use, particularly glyphosate, and the increase in the prevalence of AD. Exposure to it should be avoided (!?) as a means of preventing (?) AD and dementia in general.</p> <p>3. From the above description of the title, objectives and conclusions, it is unclear what the work is devoted to: pesticides in general or glyphosate specifically: the title indicates glyphosate, while the technical text and publications mainly deal with pesticides, and in the list of the main 59 works, only 2 are devoted to glyphosate</p> <p>In general, the article does not contain the results of data analysis with significant generalizations, and does not meet the qualitative requirements of a review article designed to highlight the state of an important scientific problem, in this case the role of pesticides in the progression of Alzheimer's disease. disease.</p> <p>the bibliography includes at least one article (No. 85) that have nothing to do with pesticides or glyphosate,</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	