

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_98099
Title of the Manuscript:	DOES PSYCHOACTIVE SUBSTANCE USE AFFECT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF MEDICAL STUDENTS?: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
Type of the 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>)

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)	Yes, the study is important as it covers an important health issue Yes Yes Yes Yes, but the inclusion and exclusion criteria are not well defined. All points mentioned in exclusion is just the opposite of inclusion which doesn't sounds fine. No relevant other points were mentioned there. Yes, references are fine.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, overall article is good. But, the sentence after reference 17 seems meaningless or disconnected to previous sentences.	
Optional/General comments	The study is good and highlight an important area	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T. Vithya
Department, University & Country	AI Ameen College of Pharmacy, India