

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_97794
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of the Hippocampus in Borderline Personality Disorder: Structural and Functional Abnormalities
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.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. The manuscript is important for the scientific community. 2. The title is ok. 3. Need to do some improvements in the abstract based on the suggestion mentioned below. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript need revision. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. It is suggested to add more latest references. Thank you for your valuable paper. I have reviewed the manuscript. It is an interesting piece of research and it further supports the current literature on BPD. Though the manuscript is clearly written, the important aspect describing the methodology is not mentioned in the manuscript. How the literature was searched? Which database was used? The keywords used for the data search? All these queries should be addressed before publication of the manuscript. I will suggest to follow the guidelines of Preferred Reporting items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) and write the manuscript accordingly.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Major Revision	
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:	Akbar Husain
Department, University & Country	Aligarh Muslim University, India