

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_102063
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Dialectical Behavioral Therapy on Egyptian Patients with Borderline Personality Disorder: A Comparative Study
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> <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. Very important, definitely 2. It might, maybe need slightly improved 3. It needs revision 4. Yes 5. Definitely 6. It needs revision</p> <p>Title Please consider revising. Strengthen the effectiveness of DBT for BPD. Example: Efficacy of DBT in BPD patients in Egypt population: a comparative study</p> <p>Abstract Please revise. Method should include DBT measurement procedures. Utilized statistical analysis in the study. Please revise. The conclusion ought to align with the study's title and objective. Effectiveness was not the same as efficacy.</p> <p>Method Data collection Please add. Add validation score (such as Cronbach alpha) for these questionnaires.</p> <p>Discussion Please add. Add study's limitation</p> <p>Reference Please revise. 24 references (total 36) were more than 10 years.</p> <p>Table 1, 2, 3, 4 Please revise.</p> <p>1. Add abbreviations for DBT, TAU, PBD, OCD, PTSD, etc</p> <p>2. All p-value were accompanied with unidentified superscripts. DELETE all supercript (p, ^{MC}p, etc)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It may need slightly revisions.	
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:	Indrayadi Gunardi
Department, University & Country	Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia