

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_95908
Title of the Manuscript:	Plant Medicine Healing! Discovering the Roots of Psychedelic-Assisted Therapy in Mental Health
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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The manuscript title is good and focuses on a new method of treating mental disorders. The abstract needs modifications. The Psychedelic-Assisted Therapy should be defined for comprehension. It Some interpretations may be added as to how this therapy works. Some details of inclusion and exclusion criteria may be added.</p> <p>4. The introduction needs improvements. The author/s should sharp the study arguments. More details are needed to clarify the history of the therapy. The arguments behind the study should be made explicit. The study objectives should be mentioned explicitly. Some participants' details should be added. More statistical values should be reported preferably in tables or figures. The conclusion also needs modifications. It should generally be started by stating the study objectives followed by the major findings obtained. Then they are interpreted in light of extant theoretical and empirical findings. Novel findings should be highlighted. Interpretations of the results need improvements. Thus, the conclusion of the study may be modified to add more interpretations. Some suggestions for future directions and implications for prevention and policy may be added at the end of the discussion.</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 strongly suggested.	
Optional/General comments	The study topic, its design, methods, processing and presentations are well presented. The study results can make important contributions to the field of knowledge. The manuscript will require major revisions before it will be accepted.	

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:	Gyanesh Kumar Tiwari
Department, University & Country	Dr. Hari Singh Gour Central University, India