



UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE MINAS GERAIS
FACULDADE DE MEDICINA
LABORATÓRIO INTERDISCIPLINAR DE INVESTIGAÇÃO MÉDICA

Av. Prof. Alfredo Balena 190 / sala 281

Belo Horizonte – MG – Brazil

Postal Code: 30.130-100

Phone: +55 31 3409.9300



UFMG

Belo Horizonte, June 10th , 2021.

Prof. Dr. Rajesh R Tampi
Editor - World Journal of Psychiatry

Dear Prof. Dr. Rajesh R Tampi,

Please find enclosed the revised version of the manuscript entitled “Psychoeducation in Bipolar disorder: a systematic review”.

We kindly appreciated the comments of the reviewer and tried to address the recommendations. Response to reviewer comments is in the next page. All changes in the revised manuscript were written in red characters to ease revision. We also improved the use of English as suggested.

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Izabela Guimarães Barbosa
Department of Mental Health, Medical School
Federal University of Minas Gerais, UFMG, Brazil

Reviewer comment

Reviewer 1: Rabelo JL et al.: Psychoeducation in Bipolar disorder: a systematic review This is a systematic review of studies evaluating the effect of psychoeducation in bipolar disorder. Unique feature of the review, that not only papers published in English, but also papers published in Portuguese were included. Nevertheless I could identify only one Portuguese paper in the list of references (Ref 74). Further value of this review, that it gives a detailed analysis about the effectiveness of different psychoeducation modalities. Conclusions are based on the results and limitations are correctly listed. Comments to improve the quality of the manuscript:

1. The title: List of References should be in English.

Correction performed as suggested, see page 15.

2. Description of studies and Figure 1: the subchapter, as well as the flow chart is hard to follow. The aim of this subchapter and flow chart is to demonstrate how the initial group of publications was condensed to the final group included in the analysis. But the steps of this process are not evident from the text and the chart.

We thanks for the point. We changed the text (see page 8) and the figure 1 in order to clarify the screen process.

3. Please correct it! In the description of studies part authors mention 45 included publications and then in the next paragraph 36 included clinical studies. As duplications were excluded, I ask authors to explain this discrepancy.

We thank the reviewer for the duly comment. We correct the phrase on order solve this discrepancy (see page 8).

Reviewer #2: Comments to the Author : Thanks for the opportunity for me to review the article entitled "psychoeducation in bipolar disorder: a systematic review. "The authors conducted a systematic review to explore whether psychoeducation interventions for patients as well as their relatives can make a difference in some aspects, such as reduction in frequency of new mood episodes, the length of hospital stay and so on. These findings may bring good news to bipolar disorder patients. However, there are some severe weaknesses that can be modified. Below I provide both broad and specific comments with the hope that this paper will be improved in the next submission.

1. Abstract: for the methods part of the abstract, authors have no description of the literature database at all. This part can be written with more details.

We thank for the duly comment and correct the methods abstract.

2. Introduction: Overall, the content of introduction is not comprehensive enough. Additionally, the amount of literature included is not enough, either. Therefore, it would be better if the author could write it again with these below suggestions. For the first paragraph of introduction, there is no description of therapy for bipolar disorder, with no mention of psychoeducation. For the second paragraph, we do not know whether there are some other similar reviews about psychoeducation for bipolar disorders or not. If they do exist, the author should show us the better part of his own review compared with currently published articles (Psychoeducation for relapse prevention in bipolar disorder: a systematic review of efficacy in randomized controlled trials. Bond K, Anderson IM). The author should explain the reason that meta-analysis was unable to be performed. Or, just include no meta analysis into limitations part. The last paragraph poorly explains the purpose of psychoeducational interventions to relatives of patients, and readers may be confused about it.

We correct the introduction considering the reviewer's suggestions, page 5.

3. Methods: in terms of review methods, "there were no date restriction criteria." This sentence can be written more clearly.

We included studies up to April 2021. This phrase was included (see page 6).

4. Methods: the authors has searched too few literature database. Please conduct the literature searching again with more database.

We thank for the comment and we performed a new search, and screened also the SCOPUS database (see figure 1). We included some new studies and them were included in the new version submitted.

5. Methods: "The systematic review has been registered in the international Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) registration number: CRD42020168910." Maybe this sentence can be placed at the top of the methods part.

We performed the correction as requested (see page 6).

6. Result: at the part of characterization of included studies, author should give us the reasons why non-randomized articles are included.

We thank for the comment and correct the information (see page 8).

7. Result: The statistical indexes which can reflect the results of psychoeducation programs are needed. Please try to provide the quantitative outcome as possible.

We included the p value for each study on table 1 and table 2.

8. Discussion: for the limitation part, author should add some contents such as the limitation that meta-analysis was unable to be performed.

We included that meta-analysis was not performed as limitation (see page 13).

9. Reference: The format of reference is not united.

We performed the correction of references.

10. It is about format of figure and table. The "=" sign in Figure 1 should be preceded by a space. In Table 1, there is extra space before the year. For example, "Wiener et al., 2017", an extra space was placed before the year 2017. It should be deleted. Table 3 and Table 4 lack space before year.

We performed the correction as requested.