

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_96936
Title of the Manuscript:	Introduction of grading system to assess female sexual and reproductive psychiatry and identification of a new syndrome. Statistical validation in a sample Russian population
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The purpose of the manuscript is to present the authors research on female sexual and reproductive psychiatry. It also describes the identification of a new syndrome. The topic is very important, interesting and not well studied. It is in line with the scope of the journal. The paper will be a valuable contribution both to our knowledge and to practice. Yet, the paper needs revision in order to be accepted for publication.</p> <p>The title is too long. It will be better if it is shorter. Perhaps the authors may delete the second part of the title, i.e. "Statistical validation in a sample Russian population."</p> <p>The abstract is good, the structure of the manuscript is appropriate and the paper is scientifically correct. The references are sufficient.</p> <p>A careful second read will help authors to make the text better and avoid mistakes. If spell and gramma check is applied, it will help authors to avoid spelling mistakes, missing commas and spaces. Nouns must agree with their verbs.</p> <p>If possible, ask a colleague, fluent in English, to help with the language. This will assist to make some corrections. Example: "candidates who participated in the survey". Candidate is not the best word. May be just participants in the survey or participants or subjects.</p> <p>For the good order, the full name has to be added when an abbreviation is used for the first time in the text (examples: OCD, HDL, LDL ...)</p> <p>Tables: Please check the sum of the percentages. If the sum is not 100% explain why – missing answers, etc.</p> <p>Comment: page 9, "17% of the candidates proclaimed to have chronic depressive disorder". Hope the authors have taken into consideration that most of the medicines prescribed to treat depression diminish sexual activity.</p> <p>If the authors use "Female reproductive and sexual psychiatry" and "gynecological psychiatry" as synonyms, this has to be mentioned.</p> <p>Try to avoid statements as "crimes against women in India in 2021 was 1,775 as per official data", if the source is not cited.</p> <p>References have to be checked again and corrected, where necessary. Example: 9. Faraji & Guler, 2021; Borderline Personality Features and Jealousy Traits in University Students. Part of the bibliography is missing. All details are available at https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1777954</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, in general	
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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Malina Jordanova
Department, University & Country	Space Research and Technology Institute, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Bulgaria