

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 48172

Title: Dissociation and disasters: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 02989927

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-12 08:28

Reviewer performed review: 2019-04-13 04:23

Review time: 19 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dissociation and disasters: A systematic review, by Canan 2019. This a review that have searched Embase, Medline, and PsychINFO, up to 2019. In total, 53 articles were analyzed. Retrieved studies were organized as child and adolescent disaster survivors (Table 2) and exposed disaster workers (Table 3). The topic is original and merits be



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

published. However, some methodological aspects need be improved. Please clarify what you meant for "systematic computerized literature search" (Methods section). The authors might want to add supplementary material for (a) the search arguments and (b) a list of excluded articles with the reason of exclusion. I have not found an in-depth analysis of the quality of articles (e.g., Newcastle Ottawa or other assessment). This is essential to achieve a trustworthy systematic review. You may scale down and organize the Discussion in subheadings, straight to your research question. The psychopathological discussion of the dissociation is welcome. Please finish this article with a conclusive learned lesson. The take-home message must address your research question (dissociation in disasters).

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 48172

Title: Dissociation and disasters: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 02445242

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-16 17:40

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-01 16:27

Review time: 14 Days and 22 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although the subject is important I had a few reservations regarding the background, methodology and findings of this review. 1. There are two concepts of dissociation - both derived from Janet's work [van der Hart & Horst, 1989 Journal of Traumatic Stress]. One (mentioned by the authors) is - disintegration or splitting of various mental

functions such as memory, perception, emotion from each other -also referred to as traumatic or structural dissociation. The other is referred to as the "narrowing of the field of consciousness" - defined by Janet as the "as the reduction of the number of psychological phenomena that can be simultaneously united or integrated in one and the same personal consciousness." This concept is more useful in explaining normative dissociative experiences (e.g. daydreaming) but has also been linked to "hysteria" by Janet and others. Although the latter concept probably has little bearing on a review of trauma and dissociation but it should nevertheless be mentioned for sake of completion.

2. If it is the authors' contention that this is a systematic review, then ideally PRISMA guidelines should have been followed. That would require more details such as a completed PRISMA checklist, the flow chart in PRISMA format, the instrument used to rate quality of studies and the procedure/instrument for assessing risk of bias. The last would be particularly important because of the small number of studies involved. Alternatively, it would be more appropriate to refer to the manuscript as a review.

3. The terminology used to refer to dissociation has to be clarified. The authors use several overlapping terms that are quite confusing. These include dissociation as stated in the abstract (AIM The purpose of this review is to systematically evaluate the literature on the association between disaster and dissociation to determine the prevalence and incidence of dissociation after exposure to disaster and further examine their relationship.) In the Methods section of the abstract they write that they searched for "studies examining dissociative disorders or symptoms related to a disaster in adult or child disaster survivors and disaster responders." In the introduction apart from dissociation & dissociative disorders, a new term dissociative psychopathology is used. In their results they state that : "The majority of the studies (n=40) had a primary focus on posttraumatic stress,.." They however do not define posttraumatic stress. In different studies posttraumatic stress has been used to refer to



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

anxiety and dissociative symptoms, transient dissociative symptoms or even a normal (and short lasting) reactions to trauma. In fact, in another review by van Der Hart and colleagues [Journal of Trauma & Dissociation, Vol. 9(4) 2008] the term posttraumatic stress (PTS) has been used to refer to three different phenomena - general PTS reactions, PTSD symptoms, and formal PTSD diagnoses. General PTS reactions referred to intrusions and avoidance reactions that were quite common after experiencing emotionally intense experiences. The term PTSD symptoms referred to the specific symptoms of PTSD according to the DSM. It appears from what they state later in the results that the authors are equating posttraumatic stress with dissociative symptoms, but they do not comment on whether posttraumatic stress was normal or pathological, short lasting or prolonged. Finally, in their results they write that: "The Peritraumatic Dissociative Experiences Scale (PDEQ) was used in 49% of the studies" Thus, they introduce another term peritraumatic dissociation, which is different from all the rest of the terms. 4. The final puzzling bit was the author's assertion that: "No prior reviews have been published on dissociation associated with disasters." Even a cursory search of literature will reveal that there are several narrative and systematic reviews on mental health effects of disasters including dissociation [Neria et al Psychol Med. 2008 April ; 38(4): 467-480; North Curr Psychiatry Rep (2014) 16:481; North, & Pfefferbaum JAMA August 7, 2013 Volume 310, Number 5]. There are reviews on epidemiology of dissociative disorders following disasters [Galea et al Epidemiologic Reviews Vol. 27, 2005; Bromet et al Psychol Med. 2017 January ; 47(2): 227-241] and a bibliometric analysis of health-related literature on natural disasters from 1900 to 2017 [Sweileh Health Research Policy and Systems (2019) 17:18]. Additionally there are critical reviews of the association between peritraumatic dissociation and posttraumatic stress and PTSD [van Der Hart et al Journal of Trauma & Dissociation, Vol. 9(4) 2008] and at least 3 meta-analyses on the same subject [Ozer et al Psychological Bulletin 2003, Vol. 129, No. 1,



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

52-73; Breh & Seidler 2007 Journal of Trauma & Dissociation, 8:1, 53-69; Lensvelt-Mulders et al Clinical Psychology Review 28 (2008) 1138-1151]. The authors would do well to refer to these and other reviews while discussing their findings.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No