

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_86798
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationships between Risky Driving and Psychopathy Traits
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In general, it is interesting research which could be published after corrections needed to be done. (1) Abstract: It is not recommended to include methodological details (subtitles) as it is written in this paper. The abstract should be concise and include some 'invitation' to the clinicians to read the manuscript. First sentence of the abstract is quite confusing and should be omitted (it represents writer's free observation and it is not 'scientific'). (2) The citing: The author should choose (if not being suggested by the journal) which model of the citing of other authors' used opinion or findings. For example, it is recommended to put in the manuscript: Patrick, et al., (2000), or [5] under which number the author(s) will be noted in the bibliography (references). However, combined styles in the same text are not acceptable.	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor revisions recommended will make paper more scientific and more precisely clarify issues. (1) In introduction; I would suggest to say more about psychopathic personality, in particular some paragraph to clarify distinctions between psychopathy, sociopathy, and antisocial personality (see: DSM-5). Further, the author at least in 1-2 sentences should write differences between criminal and non-criminal psychopaths (see: Babiak & Hare (2006): <i>Snake in suits: When psychopaths go to work</i> ; Zepinic, V. (2019): <i>Psychopathy: Guilty mind or guilty brain</i> ; Zepinic, V. (2018): <i>Psychopathy in Serial Killers and Political Crime, Psychology, 9</i> ; Zepinic, V. (2019): <i>Beneath the mask of non-criminal psychopaths: A snake in suit, Journal of Behavioural Science & Psychology, 4</i>). This is in particular as author(s) stated on page 2 (?): "psychopathy has been described and studied exclusively in samples of offenders" what is incorrect as many studies found high percentages of the psychopaths among the politicians, CEO's, corporate managers, military officers, legal enforcement officers, etc. (2) The paper pages are not numbered; (3) delete (.) in the first sentence on page 3; (4) In Conclusion: I am of opinion that this part should be more descriptive.	
Optional/General comments	It is interesting topic and research, and with suggested corrections the paper will be more scientific and interesting to the readers and the clinicians.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vito Zepinic
Department, University & Country	UK