

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_94633
Title of the Manuscript:	Pattern and Correlations of Psychiatric Disorders among Inmates of an Old Peoples' Home in Southwestern Nigeria
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:

(<https://www.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/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	<p>First of all, I don't feel competent to judge English language and style, but I think a spelling test is required. I have provided comments on the individual sections of the manuscript below.</p> <p>General comments:</p> <p>First of all, I believe that the title of the manuscript does not reflect its content. In the title, the authors included the phrase: "Patterns and correlations"; unfortunately, neither the results of the study nor its description contain any patterns or correlations. Rather, I would suggest including the term "determinants" in the title of the manuscript, as in my opinion it is more accurate to the text.</p> <p>In addition, I would suggest replacing the term "inmates" with "residents".</p> <p>"Abstract" section:</p> <p>From the paragraph on methodology, I would suggest removing the last two sentences ("Data obtained were analyzed using SPSS version 20. P-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant."). The paragraph on the results obtained is very sparse and does not present the key findings. In addition, the conclusion paragraph completely fails to present the conclusions drawn from the results of the study conducted. I would also suggest revising the key words, as in their current form they relate poorly to the study results obtained by the authors.</p> <p>"Introduction" section:</p> <p>The last sentence of this section outlines the purpose of the study. Unfortunately, it incompletely corresponds to the purpose contained in the "Abstract" section. Please formulate a clear and uniform purpose of the conducted research.</p> <p>"Methodology" section:</p> <p>I would ask that the titles of the subsections be modified, especially: "Study area" and "Technique." In general, there are too many subsections in this section, and they contain unnecessarily fragmented text. I suggest introducing two: "Participants and procedures" and "Statistical analysis."</p> <p>In addition, I would ask for inclusion and exclusion criteria, as well as ask for information about who conducted the questionnaires with the study participants. From the authors' description, it appears only that the results were consulted with a psychiatrist.</p> <p>I will also ask for the timing of the study in this section.</p> <p>"Results" section:</p> <p>First, the description of the results unnecessarily included detailed figures in Tables 1 and 2 and Figure 1. In general, the description of the results obtained is relatively weak and needs improvement.</p> <p>I would ask you to revisit the figures in Table 1, as they do not add up to 100% in most parameters (No of children, Current employment status, Previous occupation, Previous marital status, Type of marriage). My concern is the inclusion of the last parameter in Table 1 (No of Children still in the University/Tertiary Institution), especially since no figures are included and only "-".</p> <p>In the first row of Table 1, I will ask you to modify the term "Respondent" in column two and "Frequency" in column three, as these terms do not correspond to the posted data.</p> <p>In Table 2, I will ask you to modify the term "Frequency" for the data presented in column two.</p> <p>I consider it unjustified to include the last three diagnoses "blindness, stroke, CA Prostate" in Table 2, since the manuscript is about the occurrence of psychiatric disorders. I consider the description in the text of the manuscript sufficient in this case. Furthermore, what is "CA Prostate?"</p> <p>I believe that Figure 1 is unnecessary, especially since it shows the two data described in the text along with the figures.</p> <p>Instead of Figure 1, I would suggest presenting in graphic form (figures or tables) other data relevant to the topic of the manuscript and only rather convolutedly described on page 6 of the manuscript. This is a description that includes the determinants of the prevalence of mental disorders in the studied group of people - much more important and worthy of clear presentation.</p> <p>The "Discussion" section:</p> <p>This is the longest section in the entire manuscript. It contains very interesting and relevant information to the research topic. In addition, this section contains a relatively concise presentation of the key results of the study conducted. It is unfortunate that the "Results" section does not present the obtained results in the same clear manner.</p> <p>The section "Conclusion:</p> <p>Contains important statements, which, however, do not necessarily follow from the obtained results of the conducted study.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	The "References" section: Needs to be adjusted in its entirety to meet editorial requirements.	
Minor REVISION comments	Please meticulously check and correct the text for editorial compliance.	
Optional/General comments	I don't have any.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Małgorzata Stachoń
Department, University & Country	Institute of Human Nutrition Sciences, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland