

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2632
Title of the Manuscript:	Examination of the Effective Factors on the Multiple Sclerosis Diseases
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	1. Originality and Contribution to the Literature - Topic Selection: The study aims to investigate various environmental and biological risk factors for Multiple Sclerosis (MS). This is a common topic in MS research, with many studies already exploring factors such as vitamin D deficiency, cold climate, and gender. - Original Contribution: The manuscript need to identify a new risk factor not widely studied before or offer a unique perspective on known factors. 2. Methodology - Sample Size: The study involves 45 participants from health centers in Azarbayegan and Damavand, Iran. This sample size is relatively small for studying the risk factors of a complex disease like MS, particularly when trying to identify the effects of multiple variables. A larger sample size would be necessary to ensure the statistical power and reliability of the findings. - Data Collection Methods: Data were collected through interviews and questionnaires, which are appropriate methods but have limitations in objectivity. To strengthen the study, additional methods such as biochemical assays, medical history reviews, or more extensive demographic and clinical data could be included. - Statistical Analysis: A one-sample T-test was used to analyze the data. This choice of analysis seems inadequate for the study's aims, as it primarily measures the mean difference of a single sample against a known value. Given the multivariate nature of MS risk factors, multivariate analysis methods (e.g., logistic regression) would be more appropriate to understand the interactions between different risk factors. 3. Results - Consistency of Findings: The study finds that gender (higher risk in women), cold climate, vitamin D deficiency, and age (30-59 years) are effective factors in MS. - Interpretation of Data: The interpretation of the results could be more comprehensive. For example, while the study notes that vitamin D deficiency is a risk factor, it could further explore the mechanisms involved and potential implications for prevention or treatment. The discussion of results lacks depth in connecting the findings to broader clinical or public health contexts. 4. Academic Writing and Structure - Language and Expression: The manuscript is generally clear, but there are grammatical errors and awkward phrasing in some sections. Improving the use of academic English would enhance the manuscript's readability and professionalism. - Structural Consistency: While the manuscript follows a standard format	

Review Form2

	(Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion), the Methods section could provide more detailed information about data collection and analysis. The Discussion section should more thoroughly contextualize the findings within the existing literature. 5. Conclusion and Recommendations Assessment of Findings: The manuscript provides some valuable insights into MS risk factors but does not adequately address the interactions or variations among these factors. Recommendations for Revision: Increase Sample Size: Replicating the study with a larger and more diverse sample would improve the robustness and generalizability of the findings. Diversify Methodology: Including biochemical analyses, genetic testing, or other objective measures would enhance the reliability and depth of the data. Reevaluate Statistical Methods: Employing multivariate statistical methods would provide a better understanding of how different risk factors interact and their collective impact on MS. Develop Original Research Questions: Future studies should aim to address gaps in the literature by identifying and exploring less-studied risk factors or by examining known factors in new ways. Given these considerations, the manuscript would benefit from significant revisions rather than being accepted in its current form. By addressing these points, the study could become a more substantial contribution to the field of MS research.	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Serkan Demir
Department, University & Country	Sultan Abdulhamid Han Training and Research Hospital, Turkey