

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_119973
Title of the Manuscript:	Repetitive Tran cranial Magnetic Stimulation (rTMS) Therapy in Mood Disorders and Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD)
Type of the Article	

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it is. 2. No, it needs to be revised. It is better to avoid mentioning the abbreviation in the manuscript title. It is suggested remove (rTMS) and (GAD) in the title. 3. Yes. It is concise. 4. No, it needs to be revised. It is suggested the section of literature review is removed from the manuscript because the content of this section repeated in the introduction part and other sections of the manuscript. Likewise, it is recommended that the structure and fellow in each individual section of application rTMS in MDD, BD and GAD become more cohesive. We encounter with a lot of scattered subject matter when read each section. It is better to put some subsections in each one of the sections including safety, therapeutic efficacy, specific protocols, neurophysiological long-term effects and characteristics of patients to responsible to rTMS therapy. 5. Yes, it is scientifically suitable and correct. 6. Although the references are mostly recent, it is suggested to include additional references in this manuscript. The authors should review much more articles in this regard and include descriptions regarding the age, gender, depression type-specific protocols of rTMS in mood disorders simultaneously with adding relevant references. I mention examples of them and want the authors to look for other relevant references and append them to this manuscript. <p>1.Theodoros Koutsomitros, Kenneth T. van der Zee, Olympia Evagorou, Teresa Schuhmann, Antonis C. Zamar, and Alexander T. Sack. A Different rTMS Protocol for a Different Type of Depression: 20.000 rTMS Pulses for the Treatment of Bipolar Depression Type II. <i>J Clin Med</i>. 2022 Sep; 11(18): 5434.</p> <p>2.Cotovio G, Boes AD, Press DZ, Oliveira-Maia AJ, Pascual-Leone A. In Older Adults the Antidepressant Effect of Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation Is Similar but Occurs Later Than in Younger Adults. <i>Front Aging Neurosci</i>. 2022 Jul 19;14:919734. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2022.919734. PMID: 35928992; PMCID: PMC9343621.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is semantically fine for scholarly communication. However, there are some grammatical errors and typos that have to be edited. For example, in the fifth line of page 2, "...neural recording techniques that stimulate neurophysiology and brain waves.", please put "stimulate" instead of "stimulates".</p> <p>It is seriously suggested that the authors professionally edit the manuscript by who is a native English speaker.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>At the first, I want to admire the authors for this professional effort. This review article augments knowledge regarding the effectiveness of rTMS therapy in mood disorders and anxiety patients and it provides the audience with valuable data. However, to improve the quality of the manuscript I seriously recommend doing some revisions. It is suggested to include a summary of recent relevant studies in a table. The manuscript needs major revisions.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sara Ramezani</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>California State University, USA</p>