Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_INDJ_87799**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Substance Use Disorders: Suicide and Self-Harm**
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.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/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	The topic is important and the research gives room for a number of implications. However, the design of the study is not well structured, thus the body text and the discussion. Summarized recommendations are given below: First, the title is not informative, to be revised, eg. A study of …. The design of the study is not clear and has to be rewritten and followed in Results and Discussion sections for coherence The design shall give information: Why is this objective selected, what underlies recruitment of these groups, description of the recruitment procedure, description of organization of the study, why these instruments with description of the response scales (as they determine the tests), expectations The scales and self-report scales and instruments of the study are not described, so applied analysis is not clear. The study is cross-sectional, observational is mentioned, however there is no observation. 8 scales are described for the study, however the results are only for some, to be clarified why. The comparison of the individual variables (age, sex…) for the three groups is irrelevant. What can be studied is their general effect or individual effect, however such a comparison is irrelevant It is not clear the recruitment procedure, volunteers or patients, etc.? Why is included the comparison of these 3 groups? To be explained the idea of comparison of psychiatric and addicted "normal" group to be replaced by control group P-value in-text is indicated as p <.01 / p < .05 There is no description of the 35 psychotic patients (with different diagnoses) and 35 with different addictions. However, it is well known the different effects of substances, and that different substances are preferred by people with different personal problems, there are such classifications. The distribution of the 35 addicted subjects is not clear – heroin, cannabis intake, tramadol intake and opiate intake? The table 3 describes with/without intake of the different substances, however for the same 35 addicted. The general effect of all substances can be measured if the addictions are multiple, but not individually, having in mind the respondents! Results in table 3 - having in mind the categories of suicide and self-harm intention and substances intake the correlation analysis is not relevant Table 4 is summarized in 1 sentence, it is supposed to be the most important – correlations among the variables In the conclusion reference is made to adolescents? The results in the table reveal mean age 33 years There are a number of unclear sentences, eg. the first paragraph in Discussion section - careful proofreading to be done	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Margarita Bakracheva**
Department, University & Country	**Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski, Bulgaria**