

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_130360
Title of the Manuscript:	Cognitive Behavioural Therapy for Schizophrenia Patients
Type of the Article	Short communication

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The importance of the manuscript is apt and useful to the patients who are in remission. The CBT equips them about how to deal with their residual symptoms.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is fine. “ Integrating cognitive behaviour therapy into Schizophrenia care” would be more apt.	Title changes as suggested
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are to be checked again as they are not available and to be included in Vancouver style.	Necessary changes made as suggested
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammar and spelling corrections need to be done.	Corrections made
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issues