

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_105743
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Systems Training for Emotional Predictability and Problem Solving (STEPPS) in Egyptian Patients with Borderline Personality Disorder
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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes! The paper is very important to see the significance of STEPPS in Egyptian Patients and the author did extensive statistical analysis although it require minor revision</p> <p>2. Yes!</p> <p>3. Yes! In the abstract, it is better to report statistically significant variables with their P-value</p> <p>4. No! Improve on the overall presentation of your manuscript</p> <p>5. Yes! Some statistical analysis need to be improved!</p> <p>6. Yes!</p> <p>Additional comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Some statements in the background section need to cite reff. ➤ It is not clear in the manuscript how the sample size was determined! It should be clearly stated and included in the manuscript. ➤ The sample size is 40, it is too small to make decision, and enough sample size should be taken to get good result. ➤ Sampling design were not clearly stated in the manuscript ➤ Please report the reliability and validity of the survey instrument ➤ Result section: Table 1: what is the SES? The sample size was 40, but it not obtainable in the tables if we sum the frequencies, in all tables. The author needs to improve all the tables. ➤ Limitation of the study is not included in the study 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	it should be edited by English language expertise	
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:	Birhanu Betela Warssamo
Department, University & Country	Hawassa University, Ethiopia