

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_96540
Title of the Manuscript:	Experimental Models of Schizophrenia: A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed manuscript is technically sound, and it gives a proper examination review of the schizophrenia argument. The authors have clearly stated their literature review section and their own discussion and arguments in relation to the study-based schizophrenia review. 2. Yes, the title is suitable and respects the work's overall description. 3. Abstract is clear and suitable. 4. Yes, the structure and sub-sections are appropriate for a review-type article. 5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically and technically correct to be published after a proofreading examination. 6. All the in-text references are appropriately cited and sufficient for a review-type submission. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Dear authors, in my review check-up, I encountered many English issues. Although they are minor in technical terms and grammar usage, I would kindly recommend you do an English proofreading report before publication.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Silva Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Albanian University, Italy

Review Form 1.7