

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_127367
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of the side effects after starting SSRI in the primary care settings
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript which I have received is incomplete as there are no graphs or tables in the result as well as there is no mention about the study duration of the study. Overall, I liked the manuscript as the trend of prescribing SSRIs have increased exponentially worldwide and it is important to understand the various implications about prescribing SSRIs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	A good title should be self-explanatory but here the title is incomplete as well as SSRI should be written as SSRIs because multiple SSRIs are prescribed in this study. Abstract written here is not correlating with the title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract of the article is comprehensive. Methods described is to the point as well as results are also explained thoroughly according to the word limit. Conclusion is well written along with the justification and limitation of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, but some headings are missing e.g., aim and objective, inclusion and exclusion criteria, acknowledgement and conflict of interest	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I think, this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound but it requires some changes. Stats applied are well stated and appropriate. Result and discussion are written in-depth, few headings are missing which, I have mentioned earlier. Overall, I believe this manuscript can be published after some changes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but not recent as some are quite old like 1998 or 2000.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable but can be made better.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Chavi Jain
Department, University & Country	SGRRIM&HS, India