

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_101891
Title of the Manuscript:	From Environment to Gene Expression: Epigenetics and the Development of Mental Health Disorders
Type of the Article	Short 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> <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. The manuscript is important for the scientific community. It brings to a piece of place information regarding genetic variabilities/influencers in the manifestations of some psychiatric disorders. This is valuable information as some mental illnesses become treatment resistant. Information about genetic manipulation through epigenesis may result in less dependence on pharmacotherapy for the treatment of some mental illnesses.</p> <p>2. 2. No. Some of the opinions expressed in this manuscript are not the original thoughts or findings of the author (s). This appears to be a review article with a qualitative touch. It qualifies more as a review article. The group discussions or the qualitative component of the manuscript is another thing altogether.</p> <p>3. The summary of the qualitative data or analysis is missing. It should have been reflected in the abstract.</p> <p>4. The information in the manuscript requires some transcribing for the qualitative data. This was not done. As a result, the inferences cannot be relied on for valid data. There is no analysis done in this regard.</p> <p>5. The manuscript authors should be specific about what they want. Is this article a qualitative study or a review article?</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient; however, they should have borne the corresponding numbers in the in-text citations.</p> <p>7. The author(s) may consider removing the qualitative aspect of the study and making it a review article only.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, it is.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	David N Nweke
Department, University & Country	Ebonyi State University, Nigeria