

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_96214
Title of the Manuscript:	Pattern of Psychiatric Morbidity and Associated Familial Factors amongst Children and Adolescents Attending the Psychiatry Outpatient Service
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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> <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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1-The author claims to find out the demographic and clinical profile of children and adolescent patients attending psychiatry outpatient service of a tertiary-level hospital in Nepal but a summary of the general description was provided without displaying any correlation between Pattern of Psychiatric Morbidity and Associated Familial Factors amongst Children and Adolescents. In addition, typing error and grammatical error are spotted throughout the manuscript. Therefore, much effort is needed to polish the writeup.</p> <p>2-No 3-No 4-No 5- 6-Please check and update all references with latest reference within 5 to 7 years and include them into the revise manuscript</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>For the text clarity, would you refrain from using additional words, mostly meaningless filler words, which can be omitted, or some archaic words see, e.g. "respectively", "thus", "hence", "therefore", "furthermore", "thereby", "basically", "meanwhile", "wherein", "herein", "Nonetheless", "Perceivably," etc.?</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Conclusions: This section is needed to be free from any variables or any symbols. Only main pointed like what was expected and what was achieved must be written. What signification contribution this study to the society must be mentioned in this section.</p> <p>Abstract should be more focused on the actual findings of the study. I would prefer to see some data in abstract from this study rather than its description. More specifically, abstract should be focused on scientific results than on general description.</p> <p>Please make sure the revised manuscript is being proofread by a native English speaker: Authors needs to improve the Problem statement</p> <p>Please revise and check the highlights, it should be according to the journal's requirement. The number of words for the highlight exceeded the guideline of the Journal. Please check and correct it.</p> <p>Author should emphasize what has been done in terms of the significance of the study. What is the importance of the study, what would be the contribution of the outcome of this study?</p> <p>Authors needs to increase the literature and problem st</p>	

[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:	Bahareh Shateri Amiri
Department, University & Country	Iran University of Medical Sciences, Iran