

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_98098
Title of the Manuscript:	A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF PATTERN AND PREVALENCE OF CANNABIS USE AMONG TRANSPORTERS AND ASSOCIATED ROAD TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS
Type of the Article	A systematic review

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. It would be important for the scientific community 2. Yes it is, correct title 3. Summary imprecise, the Background is extensive and redundant. Within the Data extraction and Findings, the results obtained in the systematic search on the objective are not specified. The conclusion does not speak about the pattern and prevalence of cannabis use among carriers and associated traffic accidents. 4. Yes, they are 5. Yes I do 6. Improve bibliographic citation, with a single format (APA or Vancouver) according to the journal's standards. Increase and improve bibliographic references less than 5 years old	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language can be improved	
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:	César Salvador Sánchez Marín
Department, University & Country	Perú