

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_95751
Title of the Manuscript:	Substance Use Disorder: A Case of Alcohol Withdrawal in a 40 Year Old man.
Type of the Article	Case study

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 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)	1. Please incorporate specific keywords in the abstract. 2. Introduction is not so rationale with the study. Please reframe it with much more scientific evidences. 3. The research question, why the researcher is interested for this study, is not properly visible in the introduction part. Please reframe it. 4. Lack of strong controlled methodological backup has been found in the manuscript. 5. Deficiency of scientific explanations under each heading is found in the manuscript and technically more detailed information should be given under each outcomes. 6. Outcome of this study is not generalized properly and lack of novelty found from this article. 7. Please follow the standard case study report format accordingly.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anup De
Department, University & Country	Visva Bharati University, India