

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 52321

Title: Risk factors for depression in patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

Reviewer's code: 03029582

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's country: Greece

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-11-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-11-05 19:46

Reviewer performed review: 2019-11-10 12:47

Review time: 4 Days and 17 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting study of identification risk factors for depressive symptomatology in patients with COPD. It is a well-written manuscript with adequate methodology and statistical analysis. Discussion and conclusions are relevant to the topic and references are appropriate. However there are a few points that need to be addressed: 1. In Introduction section lines 9-11 “The most common...HADS”. This statement is not justified from reference 13. Authors may use other studies to come to this conclusion e.g. Bock et al 2017, Eur Clin Resp J. 2. There are some issues regarding patients’ selection: did the authors study the files of the patients and then handed the HADS scale to them (after 2018)? Were they inpatients or outpatients? It is important to clarify the time of the completion of the scale. Were there any participants already diagnosed with depressive disorder or history of such disorder? Was anyone under antidepressants, anxiolytic or other psychiatric medication? 3. The means of HADs scores in “depressed” and “non-depressed” individuals should be reported (Table 2). If the difference is small then the clinical meaning of the results may be of reduced importance. 4. The diagnosis of depression was relied mainly on HADS (patients section line 9). Please clarify. Were they examined and interviewed by a psychiatrist? Were they given any medication? HADS is not a tool for establishing diagnosis and this should be stressed in the limitation section. Moreover it has been argued that HADS is not a reliable method of separation between symptoms of anxiety and depression and should be abandoned as measure of depression in patients with somatic diseases (Norton et al 2013, J Psychosom Res; Burns et al 2014, J Psychosom Res) Rather it is proposed as a measure of general distress. This should be clearly stressed in the limitations section.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



**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>

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: 52321

Title: Risk factors for depression in patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

Reviewer's code: 02548382

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's country: Italy

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-11-04

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-12 10:31

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-12 18:29

Review time: 7 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A well-crafted paper written in quite good English, although some times imperfect. Remarks: In your abstract, you name risk factors without saying whether high or low (i.e., low BMI, low FEV1, and high CAT). In Introduction, "somatic" hospitals makes no sense, you should put general hospitals. In Materials and Methods, exclusion criteria, did you exclude major depressive disorder comorbidity? You should state this. You should also make clear that you investigate the symptom depression, not the disorder. In describing the CAT scores, you should state that lower scores indicate less severe symptoms, with higher symptoms indicating more severe COPD pictures. In Results, "Patients' demographics are demonstrated (Table 1)" should read "Patients' demographics are shown in Table 1". Further on, "The results showed that low BMI (OR = 0.893, $P < 0.05$), low FEV1 (OR = 0.325, $P < 0.05$) and CAT score (OR = 1.111, $P < 0.05$) were independent risk factors for depression" should be "Low BMI (OR = 0.893, $P < 0.05$), low FEV1 (OR = 0.325, $P < 0.05$), and higher CAT score (OR = 1.111, $P < 0.05$) were independent risk factors for depression". In Discussion, you say that depression occurs in 7-42% of persons with COPD, citing [11], a 2005 paper. Yet, you stated both in Abstract and Introduction that it ranges 10-42%, citing [7,8] of 2001 and 2003. You should render this point consistent. In the same sentence, "up to two times often than in persons without COPD" should be "almost twice as often than in persons without COPD". In the last paragraph, you state twice that you need larger samples and multicentre studies (which is not true, as it may create other problems with intersite differences) and longitudinal designs; choose just one. In Tables, substitute >0.05 with n.s., specifying below that it means not significant.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



**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>

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: 52321

Title: Risk factors for depression in patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

Reviewer's code: 03722832

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DNB, MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's country: India

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-11-04

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-12 14:54

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-14 16:33

Review time: 2 Days and 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Why does author say the sample size is small ?

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: 52321

Title: Risk factors for depression in patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

Reviewer's code: 02476743

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Statistician

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-11-04

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-13 00:48

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-19 03:44

Review time: 6 Days and 2 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall comments: This study was performed to determine the risk factors for depression in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. They concluded that BMI, FEV1, and CAT score were identified as independent risk factors for depression in patients with COPD. Basically, the study designs and methods used are appropriate, and the interpretations of the results are reasonable. However, the methodological section was somewhat inadequate. There are several areas where the manuscript needs to be strengthened. Specific comments: 1. Please give the power of data collection. 2. Flow chart of selection of the study population is suggested. 3. A statement including the reference number of the ethics committee where appropriate should appear in the manuscript. 4. From the epidemiologic viewpoint, there are many confounding factors in the evidenced-based researches. How the authors deal with associated confounding factors in this study? 5. Please show the exact p-value. 6. More discussion regarding the medical policy implications of their findings would be essential for the use of methodology in medical decision making. 7. Please consider the comparison with the other epidemiological studies in other areas using table so make clear the significance of this study. 8. The authors should add the comments related to selection bias in this study to the perceived limitation subsection. Totally, I would like to congratulate the authors for the enthusiasm invested in this study. However, the manuscript does not reach the level of quality required for publication as original research without major revision in World Journal of Psychiatry.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[] The same title



**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

☐ 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: 52321

Title: Risk factors for depression in patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease

Reviewer's code: 02445209

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's country: Czech Republic

Author's country: China

Manuscript submission date: 2019-11-04

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-12-12 19:16

Reviewer performed review: 2019-12-19 08:39

Review time: 6 Days and 13 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, I have a few comments on your manuscript: - Patient demographics: You write on the household income type of the patients. You use general terms like "low income", "medium income" etc. It would be interesting if you state how much US dollars a low or medium income is, and how much the average income in the country is. - Results: You have the title "The cutoff value, sensitivity, and specificity of BMI, FEV1, and CAT score for diagnosing bone metastasis". In my opinion, there should be "depression" and not "bone metastasis". - Discussion: The last part starting with "In conclusion, based on the analysis..." - the information here is duplicate with informations you give in Discussion above. You should change the text "In conclusion..." to a non-duplicate text. - Table 1: Why is the number of males so big and the number of females so small? Are there any medical or other reasons? Best regards The reviewer

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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