

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_88884
Title of the Manuscript:	Alzheimer's disease and the Possible role of vitamin D
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Acronyms are not defined in the abstract. If an acronym is defined, the words to which the defined acronym refers should no more be used. (AD)- In the abstract you should focus on the role of vitamin D in Alzheimer's disease to develop the abstract, it is the most important idea in the abstract so it cannot be the shortest.- (In the abstract) The objective of a research is not written in the future tense. Write in the past or present tense, I recommend the past.- Google scholar is not a database.- You should not make citations for articles that you did not use, much less review. At the end of the methods refer to do this.- The last fragment of the section "Vit D status and risk of AD" is more suitable for the section "Vitamin D and neuroprotection".- The section "Vit D can it prevent AD" is more about its treatment than their prevention.- The conclusions are not a resume of the research. They are the most important and necessary reasoning arrived at by the authors in the course of the research. They are not usually so extensive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-done-done-done-done-done-done-done-I prefer to leave it as it is to make certain info clear
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- (In introduction) The objective can be written more concretely and still contain the main idea of the research.- In the section "Vitamin D and neuroprotection". I recommend not to link risks with benefits. They may address only the role of vitamin D in Ca++ absorption or else in antioxidant pathway gene expression.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-done-done
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>	