



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_INDJ_21501</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A SELF-INCRIMINATING CASE OF MYTHOMANIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case Study</b>

**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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Lines 5-6, 9-10, and 106 need to be reframed.</b>	we had the article edited for English language and expression mistakes (Lines 5-6, 9-10, and 106)
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<p>The paper could also give some examples of one or two other cases and how this case differs from the earlier cases of Mythomania, in the literature, and what progress were made in their cases after treatment.</p> <p>Since the treatment in this case could not reach a logical conclusion, what further line of action could have been taken or will be taken, needs to be specified.</p> <p>What are the legal conclusions drawn after the case was studied by the author.</p> <p>All this needs to be included to make the paper more comprehensive</p>	We thank you a lot for your interest and support.