

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJMPCP_122096</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Strategic Mitigation of Depression through the Instrumentality of Critical and Positive Thinking for Mental Health</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The study itself is very important as it highlights how successfully and easily depression can be deal, which nowadays is considered as one of the most common mental health issue. This study emphasizes the possibility for combining critical and positive thinking as powerful tools in an organized plan to successfully deal with and manage depression, providing a broader path to mental well-being.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title is aspirational and ambitious however, its complexity and confusing vocabulary i.e of term "instrumentality" might be streamlined for greater clarity and focus.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Although the abstract contains the major aspects, it is vital to include the conclusion and results to better clarify the study's aims and objectives.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Incorporating discussion chapter that cite more recent research could greatly increase the findings' overall usefulness and applicability. Similarly, using the most recent statistical software to analyze the data will significantly improve the results' correctness and rigor.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Combining research questions ii and iii into a single, coherent question might lead to a more targeted investigation, which might improve the study's overall significance and depth.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Replacing old intext citations with the latest ones will increase the overall scientific impact of the study. Similarly follow APA 7<sup>th</sup> edition for the references.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The overall quality of the article is good.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The article's quality might be significantly improved by including the most recent research techniques and instruments. The study is in line with current academic standards and the use of cutting-edge approaches enhances the validity and accuracy of the findings. By maintaining the research's relevance and competitiveness, this strategy eventually raises its influence and value within the area.</p>	

### Review Form 3

#### **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>Syeda Nadia Shah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Islamia College University Peshawar, Pakistan</b>