



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_6083
Title of the Manuscript:	Celiac and non-celiac forms of gluten sensitivity: shifting paradigms of an old disease
Type of the Article	COMMENTARY

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	I think this review paper is interesting, because describes very well the main characteristics of this new entity "Non-celiac gluten sensitivity" whose correct acronymus and abbreviation should be "NCGS" instead NGS. The number of references is too short and it would be recommended to amplify. The Figure of the paper is very well designed. We recommend to define more the main differences between Celiac Disease (CD) and this entity of NCGS	Authors would like to thank to this reviewer for his/her helpful and professional comments. We replaced the NGS with NCGS and highlighted corrections in the revised version. We also expanded number of references. We included and highlighted some additional differences between the CD and NCGS. However, we would like to emphasize that main purpose of this commentary article is to point out that this is a new and understudied topic where very little is known (NCGS). Thus, to have the precise idea about CD vs. NCGS differences is not yet possible.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please change NGS by NCGS	Done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please amplify a little more the extension of your paper	Done.
---	--	-------