



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_42988
Title of the Manuscript:	MEAN PLATELET VOLUME IN DEPRESSION AND ANXIETY DISORDER-A HOSPITAL BASED CASE CONTROL STUDY
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The Introduction section lacked extensive literature review. The aims and objectives of the study were not declared. The justification for the study was not stated. All the references mentioned in the Introduction Section were obsolete. For example, Reference 1-7 (1999-2000). Recent references should be search from the literature and quoted.</p> <p>Methodology - Setting -in which city and country was the study carried out How was the sample size determined? The numbers (76) and (90) in the lines 58 and 59 mean what? Measures - Kindly write more about the HAM-A and HAM-D including their psychometric properties. Have the psychometric instruments been standardised and validated for use in your culture and environment? Results - The HAM-D does not diagnose Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymic or Recurrent Depressive Disorder. The HAM-A neither diagnose generalised anxiety disorder, panic or social anxiety disorders. They are screening instrument to evaluate for probable anxiety or depression. He Discussion Section was written based on the faulty results. The comparison with other findings from other countries were based on very old references. The discussion should be modified to reflect the true findings of the study The reference format does not conform with the style of the journal. The majority 74% of the references were more than 10 years old. The references must also be written all over again.</p>	<p>Thank you for reviewing the article and we have corrected the manuscript as suggested by the reviewers This has been carried out. Recent literature of 2018,2017 and 2017 has been included in the discussion part(reference 19-22)</p> <p>The city and the country has been mentioned in the methodology. This was a duration based study. Study period was 3months We have corrected the statement in the methodology (Consecutive 76 patients of anxiety disorder and 90 patients of depressive disorder in the age group of 18-65 years).</p> <p>The diagnosis was made according to DSM 5 criteria .HAM A and HAM D have been used in the many Indian studies.</p> <p>This is rectified and new recent studies have been included in the discussion part</p> <p>New references have been included in the study</p>
Minor REVISION comments	They have been mentioned above,	
Optional/General comments	The study is a good one but must be written with current literature references.	