

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_INDJ_113223</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Tramadol Abuse among University Students in Khartoum State, 2018</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It targets an important concern among a group of productive people in a developing country. The manuscript is of public health importance and the results would be useful for related scientists.</li> <li>The title and keywords should be more inclusive of the work. The work is big and not just about the prevalence of the tramadol abuse and contains other aspects of tramadol abuse in the study group (like their attitudes, patterns of abuse and etc.). Having more inclusive name and keywords give the authors more visibility.</li> <li>The aim of the study is not mentioned in abstract. The results section needs more numbers instead of using the word "most" several times. The conclusion's second sentence is in fact a part of results.</li> <li>The subsections and structure are good and appropriate.</li> <li><b>Introduction:</b> It is like a lecture about tramadol. It is good to transfer all relevant information to the readers but it can be too much. Authors need to focus on mentioning the points related to their work and aims of conducting this study. <b>Methodology:</b> It should mention the work in details including the method of data gathering; How the questionnaire has been developed and validated by having the related references, if available; The variables should be mentioned in detail (for example, not just mentioning the sociodemographic data). <b>Results:</b> there are several duplications (no need to mention results in the Tables and Figs and also in the manuscript) and some tables can come in the manuscript and be summarized in one sentence. The name of some tables and figures do not make sense for readers. Despite the aims mentioned in the Introduction, no associations have been assessed in this study. <b>Discussion:</b> Aims of the study have already been mentioned in the Introduction session. The results should be compared with studies targeting the similar participants (in terms of age and situation). There is a bias in sampling (Most were medical students) and it can bias the results as well. <b>Conclusion:</b> there are generalization of the study results while the study is conducted on a specific sample of students. The Conclusion session is repeating the findings in the Results and finally there is not a straightforward conclusion based on the study results.</li> <li>References are good but should be uniformed in style.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The English is generally fine but needs a general revision.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript needs to be written more proficiently. I believe it has been a good job but does not meet the criteria for publication as a scientific paper in the current status. I am waiting to see the paper resubmitted after rewriting it more proficiently.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Pardis Shojaee</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>