



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_48111
Title of the Manuscript:	Depression and Suicide: The Need for Awareness of Signs of Suicidal Cognitions and Lethality
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"> • Abstract is too vague and short. The authors need to develop it a little bit. • The structure of the manuscript makes no sense at all. Introduction should be right after Abstract. Methods are not clear enough. • The authors focused mainly in psychosocial risk factors (emotions, feelings) for suicide, neglecting many other important risk factors such as psychiatric diagnosis, personality disorders, cognitive deficit, familial antecedents, migrant status, childhood traumatic events, genetics, serotonin CSF levels, access to lethal weapons, etc... • There are very few references. The author keep citing one single paper (King et al, 2012) and fail to cover a minimum of scholar / academic bibliography regarding suicidality. • The article should be re-written. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Manuscript pages should be numbered.	
Optional/General comments	Very poor manuscript.	

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?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	João Gama
Department, University & Country	Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal