

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_99513
Title of the Manuscript:	A study to assess the prevalence of Non-suicidal Self Injury and reasons for that behaviour among adults and their coping
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>)

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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>Yes, it is important for scientific community. It identifies the risk behaviour of non suicidal self injury and their coping. It can aid to policy maker, counsellor, psychiatrist as well as for community awareness and prevention of suicidal risk.</p> <p>Prevalence and coping of Non Suicidal Self Injury among adults OR /Non suicidal self Injury: prevalence and coping Yes it is</p> <p>Yes,it is.</p> <p>It is correct. References are not sufficient but recent. Add more references. Abstract lacks introduction. At body part: introduction: citation 1,2,3 belongs from same literature, objective is not clear. Sample size calculation is needed. Results: socio-demographic variables are not interpreted. coping explanation is not clear. Discussion: needs comparing and contrasting. Conclusion is same in abstract and body part. Citation and references does not match, revise it and add more. There are lot of references supporting the topic.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Srijana Pandey
Department, University & Country	Nepal Medical College and Teaching Hospital, Nepal