



COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
MEDICAL CENTER



CENTER FOR
BEHAVIORAL
CARDIOVASCULAR
HEALTH

NATHALIE MOISE, MD, MS
*Florence Irving Assistant
Professor of Medicine*
Center for Behavioral
Cardiovascular Health
622 West 168th Street, PH9-321
New York, NY 10032
Nm2562@cumc.columbia.edu

Rajesh R Tampi, MD
Editor-in-Chief
World Journal of Psychiatry

April 27, 2021

Dear Dr. Tampi:

Thank you for reviewing our Opinion submission entitled “Primary care and mental health in academic settings: Where do we go from here?”. In this internist-psychiatrist collaboration, we describe the alarming rates of mental health conditions in the US despite decades of research in the area of mental health delivery models, like collaborative care, in academic primary care settings. We note key barriers to fully reaping the potential of these treatment models specific to academic settings as well as actionable calls-to-action in the areas of education/training, technology and research in an effort to re-energize the area of integrated mental and primary care in the telemedicine era. To our knowledge, this is one of the first pieces to explore implications of collaborative care implementation and sustainability in academic medical settings.

No professional writers were involved in writing this manuscript. The manuscript is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, and all authors have approved of the manuscript and meet criteria for authorship. Additionally, there are no financial conflicts of interests. Should this article be published, we agree to release the copyright.

Thank you for considering our submission.

Sincerely,

Nathalie Moise, MD, MS, Milton Wainberg, MD, and Ravi Shah, MD, MBA

Reviewer #1:

Moise N et al.: Primary care and mental health: Where do we go from here? In this editorial, a primary care physician and two psychiatrists review difficulties with implementation of collaborative care in academic primary care settings and they propose systemic changes to improve the dissemination of mental health treatment in primary care.

We thank the reviewer for positively reviewing our manuscript.

Comment to improve the quality of the manuscript: Introduction, 2nd sentence: authors state here, that 'CC has proven effective in improving..., clinical outcomes (e.g., A1c)'. In a meta-analysis, Christina Van der Feltz-Cornelis et al. (Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 2010 Jul-Aug;32(4):380-95.) found that while CC significantly improved depressive symptoms, had no effect on glycemic control in patients with DM.

Thank you for this excellent recommendation. We have included this reference.

Reviewer #2:

Thank you for opportunity for reviewing this invited editorial "Primary care and mental health in academic settings: Where do we go from here?" Totally, I would like to congratulate the authors for the enthusiasm invested in this manuscript. This manuscript does reach the level of quality required for publication as editorial in World Journal of Psychiatry.

Thank you for your enthusiastic review of our manuscript.

Language quality

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

Thank you we had a copy editor review our manuscript.

Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes an editorial of the primary care and mental health in academic settings. The topic is within the scope of the WJP. (1) Classification: Two Grades B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: In this editorial, a primary care physician and two psychiatrists review difficulties with implementation of collaborative care in academic primary care settings and they propose systemic changes to improve the dissemination of mental health treatment in primary care. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There is 1 table; (4) References: A total of 27 references are cited, including 18 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is 1 self-cited reference. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

We thank the science editor for these excellent comments. WE have reviewed our references and removed any improper references. The self-cited reference is less than 10% of the total references.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The study was supported by AHRQ. The topic has not previously been published in the WJP. 5 Issues raised: (1) The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; (2) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); and (3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Thank you for your careful review. We have included an author contributions section. We have uploaded our conflict of interest forms. Please clarify if any other forms are needed. We have included PMCID and DOI numbers to the reference list and included all authors.

Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Psychiatry, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Thank you for your careful review.