

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_104127
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of Policy Analysis: Gender Equality in Saudi Arabia's Mental Health Policy
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The manuscript title is ok. The abstract is also ok. Please add a short conclusion. I suggest language editing to the abstract and the whole of the manuscript. Please more clear interpretations.</p> <p>4. The introduction needs minor modifications. Please present a through summary of mental health policies of other countries to situate your study context. Authors are encouraged to add citations to support their claims. The author(s) should sharpen the study arguments. The arguments behind the study should be made explicit. Thus, the introduction needs minor improvements.</p> <p>The method section is ok.</p> <p>The results are also appropriately presented.</p> <p>Discussion should generally begin with the statement of study objectives and subsequent key findings. The study results are then interpreted in the light of existing theoretical and empirical findings. The interpretation of the results needs to be improved.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language editing is suggested.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	An overall technical fit may be assessed.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gyanesh Kumar Tiwari
Department, University & Country	Doctor Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya, Central University, India