PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

19 September 2022   The review report on the manuscript, titled "College Student Emergency Online Learning Satisfaction during COVID-19 Pandemic：A Cross-sectional Survey based on Personal Characteristics, Mental Status, and Coping Style," by Zhai XY et al., submitted to World Journal of Psychiatry Manuscript ID: 87497   Dear Authors,

During the COVID-19 pandemic, several factors were assessed to determine the satisfaction of college students in Hebei province with emergency online learning.   In the present manuscript, entitled "College Student Emergency Online Learning Satisfaction during COVID-19 Pandemic：A Cross-sectional Survey based on Personal Characteristics, Mental Status, and Coping Style," Zhai and colleagues assess the factors associated with emergency online learning satisfaction among college students in Hebei province during the pandemic.   The main advantage of this manuscript is that it presents the majority of college students in Hebei province during the COVID-19 pandemic reported good satisfaction with emergency online learning (62.9%), while 33.2% reported general satisfaction and 3.9% reported poor satisfaction. Personal characteristics such as age, gender, and major were not significantly associated with

emergency online learning satisfaction. Factors such as curriculum arrangement, learning environment, personal characteristics, mental status, and coping style were all significantly associated with emergency online learning satisfaction. Coping strategies such as problem-solving, positive thinking, and seeking social support were positively associated with emergency online learning satisfaction, while avoidance coping was negatively associated with satisfaction. In general, I think the idea of this manuscript is really interesting, and the authors' fascinating observations on this timely topic may be of interest to the readers of the World Journal of Psychiatry. However, some comments, as well as some crucial evidence that should be included to support the author's argumentation, needed to be addressed to improve the quality of the manuscript, its adequacy, and its readability prior to publication in the present form, in particular by reshaping parts of the introduction and Descussion sections by adding more evidence and theoretical constructs. Please consider the following comments: 1.Please   present the concise, self-explanatory title stating the most important findings of this study. Suggestion: "Surviving the Shift: A Study on College Students' Satisfaction with Emergency Online Learning during COVID-19 Pandemic" [1–3]. 2.Abstract: I would like the authors to make as much effort for this section as for the rest of the manuscript. Please present the abstract in 200 words (preferably 200–220 words, max. 250) according to the guidelines of the journal [4], focusing on proportionally presenting the background, methods, results, and conclusion The background should include the general background (one to two sentences), the specific background (two to three sentences), and the current issue addressed to this study (one sentence), leading to the objectives. In this subsection, I would like the authors to lay out basic information, a problem statement, and their motivation to break off. The methods should clarify the authors' approach, such as study design and variables, to solve the problem and/or make progress on the problem. The results should close with a single sentence putting

the results in more general context. The conclusion should open with one sentence describing the main result using such words like "Here we show", which should be followed by statements such as the potential and the advance this study has provided in the field and finally a broader perspective (two to three sentences) readily comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline [5–7]. 3.Keywords: I advise listing as many keywords allowed by the journal from Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) [8] and use as many as possible in the title and in the first two sentences of the abstract. 4. Core tip: Please present a core tip according to the journal's guidelines [4]. 5. Introduction: The authors need to fully reorganize this section with several paragraphs made up of about 1000 words, introducing information on the main constructs of this protocol, which should be understood to a reader in any discipline and make persuasive enough to put forward the main purpose of current research the author has conducted and the specific purpose the author has intended by this protocol. I would like to encourage the authors to present the introduction starting with the general background, proceeding to the specific background, rationales, and finally the current issue addressed to this study, leading to the objectives. Those main structures should be organized in a logical and cohesive manner [9]. 6.Methods: The methods section opens with a short introductory paragraph and cite more references to ensure the reliability and the integrity of evidence in the study design the authors build and the methodology they have decided to apply.

7. Results: I recommend closing this section with a paragraph that puts the results into a more general context. 8. Discussion: I would like the authors to fully expand this section without subsections by opening with an introductory paragraph, followed by a synthesis of the previous sections. Then, I expect the authors to develop arguments clarifying the potential of this study as an extension of the previous work, the implication of the findings, how this study could facilitate future research, the ultimate goal, the challenge, the knowledge and technology necessary to achieve this goal, the

statement about this field in general, and finally the importance of this line of research. It is particularly important to present its limits, its merits, and the potential translation of this protocol into clinical practice [10,11]. 9. Conclusion: I believe that presenting the independent conclusion section with 150–200 words would benefit from a single paragraph without subheadings that presents some thoughtful and in-depth considerations by the authors as experts in order to convey the main message. The authors should make an effort to explain the theoretical implications as well as the translational application of their research. In order to understand the significance of this field, I believe it would be necessary to discuss theoretical and methodological avenues in need of refinement as well as future research directions. 10. References: Please follow the guidelines of the journal [4]. Please cite more references, Typically, a review article like this cites over 60 references. Overall, this manuscript contains no figures, five tables, and 45 references. I believe that the manuscript may have merit in presenting insights into the factors associated with emergency online learning satisfaction among college students in Hebei province during the COVID-19 pandemic. The study investigated the personal characteristics, mental status, and coping style of students during this challenging time, and found that factors such as curriculum arrangement, learning environment, personal characteristics, mental status, and coping style were all significantly associated with emergency online learning satisfaction. The study also identified coping strategies that were positively associated with satisfaction, which could be useful for educators and policymakers in designing effective online learning programs during emergencies. I hope that, after careful revisions, the manuscript can meet the journal's high standards for publication. I declare no conflict of interest regarding this manuscript. Best regards, Reviewer References: 1. https://plos.org/resource/how-to-write-a-great-title/ 2. https://www.nature.com/nature-index/news-blog/how-to-write-a-good-research-

science-academic-paper-title 3.

https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/catchy-title 4.

https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/278 5.

https://doi.org/10.5812/ijem.100159 6.

https://www.scribbr.com/dissertation/abstract/ 7.

https://writing.wisc.edu/handbook/assignments/writing-an-abstract-for-your-research-paper/ 8. https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/ 9.

https://dept.writing.wisc.edu/wac/writing-an-introduction-for-a-scientific-paper/

10. https://www.scribbr.com/dissertation/discussion/ 11.

https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA_685_18

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript contents regarding observational study of satisfaction in students is attractive. However some poinst should be edited to improve.   a) The entire manuscript should be re-revised to avoid some typo mistakes. For example, in Table 1 '1nd should be st, 3nd should be 3rd and 4nd should be 4th' It isn't? b) The discussion should be enriched with sentences related to psychiatric approaches. I mean the sentences regarding the identification and treatment of mentioned disorders could improve your discussion. c) Comparisson with similar approaches in other student-populations and countries should be enlarged.   d) Conclusions section in the extended manuscript is desirable. e) Considered factors should be easy identificable in the text and tables. Particularly risk factors for satisfaction (as they are mentioned in the abstract).

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

3 October 2022   The 2nd review report on the manuscript, titled "College Student Emergency Online Learning Satisfaction during COVID-19 Pandemic: A Cross-sectional Survey based on Personal Characteristics, Mental Status, and Coping Style," by Zhai XY et al., submitted to World Journal of Psychiatry Manuscript ID: 87497   Dear Authors,

I am pleased to see that the authors have addressed the issues I raised in the previous round. Currently, the manuscript is a well-written research paper with informative layouts that assess the factors associated with emergency online learning satisfaction among college students in Hebei province during the pandemic. I believe the manuscript meets the journal's high standards for publication. I am looking forward to seeing more papers written by the same authors. Thank you! I declare no conflict of interest regarding this manuscript.   Best regards,   Reviewer