



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_44117
Title of the Manuscript:	Neuropsychological rehabilitation of intelectual activity in a patient with right brain injury
Type of the 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>Introduction: introduction is very long. As a suggestion, Authors should be more concise and objective. Ideally, introduction should be limited to 3 or 4 paragraphs about the subject and knowledge gap.</p> <p>Lines 127 – 133: this information belongs to methods section.</p> <p>Lines 135 – 150: information regarding case history belongs to results section (case report).</p> <p>Methods: information regarding methodological issues and case report are mixed in this section. The objective of methods section is to describe the evaluation and rehabilitation program. Most of the information here are related to case report and results of evaluations. Methods section is better described on the abstract.</p> <p>Tables 1 – 3: these tables summarize results of neuropsychological exams. It belongs to results section.</p> <p>Figures 2 – 3: those figures represent results of treatment. They belong to results section.</p> <p>Case report: I suggest that case report should be improved. It should be interesting to describe previous functional issues.</p>	<p>We have corrected the introduction according to all suggestions.</p> <p>Lines 127-133 – corrected for method section</p> <p>Lines 135-150 – corrected and passed to results section</p> <p>Method section: corrected according to suggestions.</p> <p>Tables 1 – 3 – passed to results section</p> <p>Figures 2 – 3 – these examples are the tasks completed during the program and were not yet the final results. It's more logic to have them in the program section.</p> <p>Case report: improved according to suggestions.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There are many grammar and orthography errors in the manuscript. I strongly suggest an extensive review by an English-speaking person. Some mistakes identified are:</p> <p>Line 38: "ASD" acronym must be coded.</p> <p>Line 62: "intellectual activity".</p> <p>Line 62: "supposedly"?</p> <p>Line 85: "precise"?</p> <p>Line 87: syndrome.</p> <p>Line 91: Cause.</p> <p>Line 92: do not.</p> <p>Line 97: syndromes.</p> <p>Line 165: frequency.</p> <p>Line 170: break.</p> <p>Line 142: work.</p> <p>Line 251: rehabilitation program.</p> <p>Results: It would be interesting to show results of cranial tomography and EEG (images).</p>	<p>We provided revision of the whole text.</p> <p>We have corrected all the mistakes on the mentioned lines.</p> <p>We were not able to access to functional images according to the policy of Mexican Public Hospitals.</p>
Optional/General comments		

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Authors need to describe that patient authorized use of images and that he did consent use of information of his case report.</p>	<p>We have included patient's consent.</p>