



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JPRI_47723 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Design and Determine Psychometric Properties of Cluster A Personality Disorder Questionnaire |
| 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>)

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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the first mentioning of one reference it should be come completely, with all authors name. For instance, for the first using Tyrer work in line 38 you used this (Tyrer et al., 2015). This is fine for the second and more. You need to mention all the authors' name. Please check for all first mentioning references. - Tables are right to left. They should be left to right. | <p>All corrections done</p> <p>ok</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interesting and useful subject. However, you may know the amount of Cronbach's alpha particularly in the clinical instruments is better to be more than .7, which can give a peace of mind to the practitioners. - Reference list needs your re-consideration to be fully matched with APA style. | <p>Corrected as per all comments</p> <p>Reference corrected</p> |
| Optional/General comments | In the method part, it was not mention which software used for analyses. | revised |

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) | |

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>