



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 69884

Title: Health care worker occupational experiences during the COVID-19 outbreak: A cross-sectional study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01221925

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: AGAF, FACS, FICS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-18 12:19

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-26 12:42

Review time: 8 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<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

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 is an excellent paper on a very important topic reporting the experience of first line personnel. Their experiences can be valuable lessons to many



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 69884

Title: Health care worker occupational experiences during the COVID-19 outbreak: A cross-sectional study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03767650

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Director, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-20 13:21

Reviewer performed review: 2021-08-29 00:39

Review time: 8 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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



**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

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 variable since the study period is during the early stage of the COVID-19 pandemic. The authors reported that health care managers should address the problems faced by health care workers by providing high-quality personal protective equipment and adequate training and ensuring a supportive and safe work environment. This study is significant in clarifying the following points. The mean score was lowest for staff working in fever outpatient departments, as well as, in terms of working hours, medical workers in Wuhan worked relatively long hours, as did those with a Bachelor's degree, who were aged 30-45 years, and had 5-20 years of work experience. Because I'm not an expert in this area, I can not understand work experience and occupational value. Please concretely describe what these are in the methods or results section. In abstract I can not understand what high score means. Please describe what high score means in the abstract. I can not clearly understand the difference between support/security and environment. Please describe this point in the methods or results section. Reference style is not adequate. Please correct that. There are some typos. Please correct them.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 69884

Title: Health care worker occupational experiences during the COVID-19 outbreak: A cross-sectional study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05871485

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-08-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-08-23 08:04

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-02 09:58

Review time: 10 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



Peer-reviewer statements Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Specific Comments Abstract: • The author should add some digits to the result section. Introduction: • What is the theoretical framework guiding the study? • The rationale of the survey needs to be better clarified. • Many papers were published regarding health care workers' physical and mental outcomes due to job stress and COVID-19 related bitter experiences. Furthermore, now a days vaccine are widely available and the number of COVID-19 affected patients are decreasing. The job related stress for the healthcare professionals are eventually minimized due to ample hospital resources and manpower. So, what is the novelty of the study in this current situation? Methodology: • The sample size seems pretty minor to represent the community. • The author should mention the sampling technique. • The sampling procedure is not adequate, needs to describe in detail. • Was there any piloting conducted before finalizing the questionnaire? Result: • "According to the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 173 participants were contacted, 5 participants dropped out, and 173 participants completed the questionnaire, including 72 from secondary and 101 from tertiary hospitals."- But initially, the author mentioned about 178 participants. But here, I observe he approached 173 respondents. In that case, the survey participants should be 168. Which one of those is correct? • "The mean working time was 24.17 (8.67) days."- I failed to identify it from the table. • "The general characteristics of the study population are presented in Table 1."- But in my MS file, Table 1 is about 'The exploratory factor analysis of work experiences questionnaire'. I am a bit confused about the referencing here. If I am not wrong, please address this. • Table 1: It should be divided according to the categories. • Table 2: Categorizations of the "level of education", "professional 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

in respect of "profession" seem pretty unclear to me. MBBS is regarded as a graduation degree. But here, I observed only 5 of them were in that section wherein the earlier number of doctors was 24. On the other hand, what is the difference between "undergraduate" and "college degree or below"? • Table 3: I accidentally failed to find the reference "The mean total work experience score (\pm standard deviation) of frontline health care workers was 65.13 (14.77) out of 128" here. Discussion: • Discussion should include more relevant papers regarding this issue. Limitation: • The author should include more limitations. Such as, "due to cross-sectional study- can we estimate the causal relationship between the variables". • What measures were taken to minimize biases? English editing is required.