



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_42662
Title of the Manuscript:	Views of future doctors on the current Mental Health Clerkship programme of a Nigerian university.
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	The duration of clerkships needs to be negotiated with other specialties since every specialty considers itself important and wants more time. Therefore, the conclusion can only be further negotiation. No one will be convinced by what a handful of students think. The best negotiation would be to convince other specialties to allow an experiment whereby 2 weeks on psychiatry is compared to 4 weeks and 6 weeks with respect to students' comfort with psychiatric patients, with psychiatric knowledge, and with interpersonal skills.	This study was on the premise of the planned review of the curriculum by the university as we stated in the paper. You cannot convince other departments to allow students spend more time (4 or 6 weeks) in Psychiatry against the 2 weeks allotted to each subspecialty by the university. Where will the students get the extra 2 or 4 weeks? Which department will sacrifice her own posting to Psychiatry since each department considers the 2 weeks inadequate? The comparison can only come when the new curriculum is reviewed and the duration extended. Hence, our recommendation for further studies in this area, not only in our centre but also in other institutions in Nigeria where the duration is short.
Minor REVISION comments	The article is too long. Minor typos.	(1). MINOR TYPOS: The reviewer did not point out any specific typographical error but the few noted typographical errors have been corrected. (2). TOO LONG: We did not exceed the maximum length accepted by the journal. Our manuscript: was in 21 pages, double-spaced (INDJ said maximum of 25 pages); has 2 figures and 3 tables (INDJ allows a maximum of 15 figures/tables); and 4,382 words in all (covering from the Title to the References) – the INDJ allows 3,000 to 6,000 words.
Optional/General comments		