

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_91853
Title of the Manuscript:	From the Pages of a Book to Real Life: The Mental Health Syndrome known as Alice in Wonderland - A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case study

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>)

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	In this article, a case with an underlying headache syndrome with symptoms consistent with Alice in Wonderland syndrome is presented. Considering the few cases in the literature, the article has the quality to contribute to the reader. Some revisions are needed; 1. The last paragraph of the introduction is not meaningful, a paragraph describing the feature of the case should be added. 2. The case should be given in more detail. Psychiatric and neurological examination findings should be explained in detail. It is unclear whether a diagnosis of migraine has been made. It should be explained which type of headache is diagnosed. 3. Laboratory and physical examination findings should be given in detail. 4. It should be explained how the patient's history of dissociative disorder, psychotic disorder was excluded. The SCID result should be given. It should be emphasized who conducted the interview at what stage. Similarly, family history should be given in more detail. 5. It is not clear for what purpose the drugs are given. It should be detailed when it was started, how long it was used, and when the responses were received. 6. How long the patient was followed, what was the process afterward, should be added to the case. 7. The view that this syndrome takes place in DSM is not very meaningful, the expression should be changed.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Most of the references are incomplete and misspelled, some sources are written twice. 2. The fact that all subsections are composed of a single paragraph makes it difficult to read. Each section should be divided into paragraphs.	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lut Tamam
Department, University & Country	Cukurova University, Turkiye