

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 86651

Title: Construction and validation of a personalized prediction model for postpartum anxiety in pregnant women with preeclampsia

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746658

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Canada

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-11 01:26

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-21 08:24

Review time: 10 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Preeclampsia is a progressive multisystem disease during pregnancy. Studies have found that women with preeclampsia are more likely to suffer from postpartum anxiety. Current research focuses on the pregnancy outcome of women with preeclampsia, and few studies involve postpartum anxiety. So in this retrospective study, Lin LJ et al. analyzed the risk factors for 528 pregnant women with preeclampsia between January 2018 and December 2021 complicated with postpartum anxiety, and constructed a predictive model to provide clinicians with an effective and practical risk assessment tool. The paper is written well, the Introduction give a good overview about the study background and the authors raised clearly the aim of the study. The description of material studied is accurate and allows to draw the conclusions. The material studied is large enough and allows to draw the conclusions. The Results are presented clearly and have been discussed well. I have only a minor point to discuss. The predictive model was clinically verified by retrospectively selecting 80 pregnant women with preeclampsia. Why choose 80 patients? Is there any basis? I recommend that the manuscript can be published after polishing the English.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 86651

Title: Construction and validation of a personalized prediction model for postpartum anxiety in pregnant women with preeclampsia

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746882

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Canada

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-14 00:25

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-21 09:00

Review time: 7 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, thank you for submitting your paper to the World Journal of Psychiatry. In your retrospective study, a total of 528 pregnant women with preeclampsia were selected to explore the factors influencing postpartum anxiety in pregnant women with preeclampsia. Various physiological and biochemical indicators were obtained through laboratory tests. Multivariate logistic regression, receiver operating characteristic curve, Hosmer-Lemeshow and other methods were used to analyze the factors influencing postpartum anxiety in pregnant women with preeclampsia and to construct a predictive model. Finally you found 126 pregnant women with preeclampsia experienced postpartum anxiety. Bad marital relationship, gender discrimination among family members, Hct, E2 and IL-6 were independent risk factors for postpartum anxiety in pregnant women with preeclampsia, and the predictive model constructed based on these factors had high accuracy. Your study is a well-written, good structured recommendation for clinical practice. Thank you for a useful and important synopsis of this important topic. I suggest that the discussion and conclusion can also be improved to increase the limitations of the article. Encourage the authors to explore broader

samples, longer time spans, different methods or techniques, and consideration of multiple variables or factors.