

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-52781

Date: 7/12/25

**Title:** To assess myths among the Attendants/Family members of the patient with Psychiatric Ailment.

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....  
**Accept after minor revision** ✓.....  
 Accept after major revision .....  
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	✓			
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: DR azdeh

Date: 13/07/25

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

*(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)*

*The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.*

*This qualitative study provides critical insights into cultural myths surrounding psychiatric illnesses in Pakistan, revealing six key themes of misconceptions that delay evidence-based treatment. Its strength lies in documenting locally prevalent beliefs (e.g., spiritual causes, preference for faith healers) and their impact on healthcare-seeking behavior. The findings are vital for designing culturally sensitive mental health interventions in low-resource settings.*

## Detailed Reviewer's Report

### Structural Clarity:

**Abstract:** Expand to include key results (e.g., "60% attributed illness to supernatural causes") and explicit conclusions.

### Tables/Figures:

Label Table 1 clearly and integrate into results (currently appears disconnected).

Remove placeholder text (e.g., "UNDER PEER REMEW IN WAR").

### Methodology:

Clarify sampling strategy: "Convenient sampling" risks bias; justify why this was optimal.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

**Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP**

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## **REVIEWER'S REPORT**

Specify interview tools: Attach the questionnaire (Appendix) as a supplement.

### **Results & Discussion:**

**Themes:** Reconcile discrepancies (e.g., "Breadment" in Results vs. "Breach" in Table 1).

**Contextualization:** Compare findings more critically with cited studies (e.g., Indian myths in Kishore et al. 2011).

**Limitations:** Acknowledge single-site sampling and recommend multi-center follow-ups.

### **References & Formatting:**

Correct formatting errors (e.g., duplicate "9." in references, inconsistent DOI links). Ensure all citations (e.g., [19], [20]) match references.

1.