

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_116110
Title of the Manuscript:	Negative Implications of Drug and Substance Use on Mental Health
Type of the Article	A systematic review

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. Considering that drug abuse is one of the current health challenges worldwide, special attention should be paid to this issue. At the first step, doing a systematic review to collect previous research in this regard seems so necessary. Thanks for selecting this important topic. 2. Title is generally good. It's better to add type study to the title as follows: <i>Negative Implications of Drug and Substance Use on Mental Health: <u>A systematic review</u></i> 3. Abstract has been written well but method is needed to be written in more details. Background is long but method is very short and general. Please summarize the background and add details to the method section. Also, conclusion is so long. Please summarize it and keep so important points. 4. This manuscript don't have clear sections and subsections. It consists of 1 (introduction) – 7 (gap) and conclusion. Where is method, result, and discussion? Subsections are confusing. Please restructure the manuscript to clear sections and subsections as follows: introduction, method (and its subsections), result (and its subsections), discussion, and conclusion. The current structure isn't appropriate. 5. The content and structure of the manuscript should be re-write. It needs to substantial revision in terms of methodology. I wrote some important point at the section 7. 6. It's good to use possible recent references in the introduction especially for the first and second paragraph. Dose the style of references match with the journal style? 7. In the method section you should add following points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please mention all databases you used (instead of mentioning ... such as ..) b) Please add search strategy of PubMed to the manuscript as a supplementary file. c) Try to mention all of your main keywords. The current keywords are not enough. d) How many papers did you find? How many has been removed during the study? (You finally reach 33 papers). Please add number of papers at each phase of screening). e) It's better to use PRISMA figure to show the number of papers at each phase of screening. f) Are authors sure about type of study? Is this a systematic review? You mentioned your search is systematic but this point it isn't enough for a systematic review. Where is your critical appraisal? Does your research question match with systematic review? (PICO). If you think this study is not systematic review, you should replace this phrase with scoping review. g) Does this manuscript have any tables? Or figures? You can classify your findings in table in a detail and structured way. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, its language is good. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript should be re-written especially in terms of methodology (search strategy, databases, result of the search). Nothing is clear. Details should be added to the method section and results.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Sepideh Harzand-Jadidi
Department, University & Country	Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Iran