

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_117454</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Pseudocyesis Explored: A Detailed Review of Associated Psychiatric Disorders.</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is considered to have made a significant contribution to the development of science, especially in women's mental and reproductive health</p> <p>Yes, the title already gives an idea of the content of the article, although a title that can be more directly interesting to the reader is recommended</p> <p>The method should present how many articles were reviewed along with the methods used in the research. It is recommended that the results be explained in more detail (if the number of words in the abstract is sufficient)</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are well appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript reviews several studies with fairly good research methods. so it can be said that the conclusions drawn can be tested scientifically.</p> <p>Yes, references are sufficient enough to support the review. Apart from the manuscripts reviewed, the theories taken are based on articles published in the last 10 years</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the English narrative used is suitable for scholars and academics</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is considered to be able to contribute to science with a technical review according to scientific methods and presented in a narrative that is suitable for the academic community</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eka Safitri Yanti</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Health Polytechnic of Pangkal Pinang, Indonesia</b>