

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_INDJ_116121</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comments on Freud and the concept of the mind and unconscious at the time of the fall of positivism</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Opinion Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>
<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>1. Yes, article is very informative and thought – provoking. It seems to provide a foundation for future research on Freudian psychoanalysis.</p> <p>2. Interpreting Freudian concept of Mind and Unconscious at the time of Fall of Positivism</p> <p>3. Abstract needs to provide a clear direction and focus for the study to help readers understand its relevance and potential implications.</p> <p>4. Yes flow of ideas in subsections and structure is quite logical and exhibits fluency in organization and presentation of arguments.</p> <p>5. Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6. Reference section should include up-to-date references with the latest developments in the field.</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>1. Yes the paper has a clear expression, quite suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Appropriate headings need to be inserted to facilitate readers understanding.</p>	

**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>
<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>Shumaila Mazhar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sardar Bahadur Khan Womens University, Pakistan</b>