

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 82883

Title: Population-based affective-disorder-related biomedical/biophysical multi-hyper-morbidity across the lifespan: A 16-year population study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02445242

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MAMS, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-05

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-03 16:52

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-12 07:31

Review time: 8 Days and 14 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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

This article is an excellent illustration of the high rates of comorbidity among psychiatric disorders. The novel method of analysis of the population-based sample provides further insight into the complex nature of comorbidity in affective disorder. I had a few minor issues about the way the results have been presented. **ABSTRACT** Introduction & objectives are similar. Ideally, a background of one or two sentences can be provided. Objectives (Aims) of the study should be separated from the background. The meaning of the terms “biomedical and biophysical morbidity” is not exactly clear. What is the distinction between them? If the authors mean psychiatric and physical comorbidity, why not use these terms instead? Other terms such as “comprehensive temporal hyper-morbidity” need to be explained. **INTRODUCTION** The references stated in the first line (Numerous studies have examined the comorbidity of affective disorders and other mental processes and disorders 1-9) are a bit puzzling since there are more comprehensive reviews of medical comorbidity in mood disorders. For example - Schaffer et al. Ann Clin Psychiatry. 2012 Feb;24(1):6-22 Ramasubbu et al. Ann Clin Psychiatry. 2012 Feb;24(1):82-90 Kilbourne. Bipolar Disord. 2004



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Oct;6(5):368-73 McIntyre et al. Ann Clin Psychiatry. 2012 May;24(2):163-9 Krishnan. Psychosom Med. 2005 Jan-Feb;67(1):1-8

METHODS One of the authors' stated objectives was to - "...present the current state of the art of biomedical and biophysical morbidity associated with mental disorder in large population-based samples in the published literature (PubMed)." Although the authors have stated that standard methodology was not followed, the details of these PubMed searches are still too sketchy. Moreover, none of the conclusions derived from this search (mentioned in the discussion) can be made out from Table 1.

RESULTS Table 2 is a very interesting comparison between individuals with and without affective disorders. But the title of the table appears somewhat incomplete. Although the text states that - "As well, there are more females than males with affective disorder and they have in total and on average a higher frequency of biomedical and biophysical diagnoses." - the table does not make this clear. Moreover, if the group without affective disorder includes individuals with other psychiatric disorders, is it possible to conclude that the rates of physical comorbidities are higher in affective disorders than other psychiatric disorders? The figures also need more comprehensive descriptions. For example, I could not understand how this conclusion was derived - "From the full distribution of age-specific proportional ratios distributions shown for males and females in Figures 3 and 6, it is apparent that females have more laboratory testing and procedures, while males have more V code diagnoses"

DISCUSSION As mentioned above, the conclusions derived from the PubMed searches are unclear. Apart from the ones mentioned, there are many other methodological lacunae in the current state of research into comorbidity in psychiatric disorders. This could be briefly mentioned in the conclusion

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 82883

Title: Population-based affective-disorder-related biomedical/biophysical multi-hyper-morbidity across the lifespan: A 16-year population study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05789838

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-05

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-13 07:06

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-15 12:22

Review time: 2 Days and 5 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

This manuscript is generally satisfactory, but the literature review as well as the discussion section are too brief and many relevant literature are not covered, and the authors are advised to further revise the literature review and discussion.