

Review Form2

Book Name:	Business, Management and Economics - Research Progress
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2194
Title of the Manuscript:	Vocational Rehabilitation for Patients with Schizophrenia
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript provides a review of vocational rehabilitation models for patients with schizophrenia, highlighting both traditional and modern approaches. However, it would benefit from a more detailed discussion on the practical implementation of these models in various cultural and economic contexts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable, However, a more precise title"A Review of Vocational Rehabilitation Models for Patients with Schizophrenia: Current Practices and Future Directions."	
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.	The abstract is ample but could benefit from including specific examples of the vocational rehabilitation models discussed and their respective outcomes. Moreover, including a brief mention of the practical implications for different cultural contexts would enhance its relevance.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, providing a clear and organized. Traditional and supportive employment models is seems effective for comparison.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. It provides a comprehensive review of the literature, including various vocational rehabilitation models and their effectiveness. The comparative analysis of traditional and supportive employment models, along with the discussion of innovative approaches, demonstrate a thorough understanding of the field. The evidence presented from multiple studies supports the conclusions drawn, adding to the manuscript's credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are sufficient and recent, covering a broad range of studies related to vocational rehabilitation for schizophrenia. But Mention most recent references.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is suitable.	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ravi Kumar
Department, University & Country	SRMS Institute of Medical Sciences, India