



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_19602
Title of the Manuscript:	The Faroe, Oerkney and Sardinia islands are pointing the dielectrophoretic force in the etiology of multiple sclerosis
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>)



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The authors English makes his concepts difficult to follow. He appears to be translating directly from his language and needs to rewrite the article completely with an English grounded scientist. Also, his various basic concepts need to be specifically defined (dielectrophoresis appears to be a form of cataphoresis? But what is the pathological force, i.e. the magnetic fields set up by the electric forces or the electric dipoles themselves??) and his previously referred to ideas need to be summarised so the reader can follow his geographical thesis. Moreover this paper is an "idea piece" and does not fit into the methods and results format of an experiment. There is a lack of integration with the effects of electromagnetism and the neuropathology and apparent autoimmune etiology of MS and which is necessary to demonstrate a possible mechanistic relationship versus simple contingency (i.e. two processes occurring at the same time in the same place but not mechanistically related). The paper wanders and seems contradictory (e.g. more electromagnetic energy for increased pathology but the conditions necessary appears to produce less such energy??) as to conclusions, although much of this could be the language problem.</p> <p>The effect of MRI on the MS neuropathology can't be followed. Certain referred to papers as Heida 2001 does not appear in the reference list??) The author does not appear to take into consideration recent MS</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	research, e.g. that the CCSVI theory has been recently completely disproven!	
	Only to the extent that the author appears to be pushing his ideas without taking into consideration up to date MS research.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	LSU school of Medicine, USA