

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 24284

Title: Peritraumatic Behavior Questionnaire - Observer Rated: Validation of the objective version of a measure for combat-related peritraumatic stress

Reviewer's code: 00784126

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-19 08:48

Date reviewed: 2016-02-01 22:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a nice article presenting a useful instrument.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 24284

Title: Peritraumatic Behavior Questionnaire - Observer Rated: Validation of the objective version of a measure for combat-related peritraumatic stress

Reviewer's code: 03525921

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2016-01-19 08:48

Date reviewed: 2016-02-22 22:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General comments

This is an interesting study which attempted to look at measures of peritraumatic stress during combat deployment using the PBQ-OR and compare this with a validated post deployment self-report questionnaire PBQ SR in order to validate the peritraumatic observer rated questionnaire. The timeframe of evaluations was not clearly conveyed early in the paper. There were references made to baseline measurements which in reality were referring to 30 days into deployment, which in all fairness should not be referred to as baseline. It is likely that not collecting data prior to deployment resulted in missing a change from true baseline stress and the levels of stress during deployment. There are indeed many difficulties with collecting data in theatre and this study had a high rate of non-response or non-return of PBQ-OR questionnaire from raters. It is entirely possible that these raters were embedded with units which were more stressed than raters who had time to complete and return the questionnaires.

The main limitation in this study is the low rate of response. Out of 860, only 62 questionnaires were returned for R3, which is a very low rate of response making it difficult to base any solid conclusions on the results. That being said, this study serves as a basis for a larger study which would serve to validate the PBQ-OR and the limited data analysed did show a trend towards it being a valid instrument at measuring peritraumatic stress.

Specific Comments

Intro

-This section states that peritraumatic stress can be a “salient clinical indicator” for PTSD, however in military personnel this stress may have a high sensitivity but not be very specific, as it is difficult to decipher who will go on to meet criteria for PTSD.

Material and methods

- What was the criteria used for PTSD diagnosis?
- Was there any data collected prior to deployment?
- I question why start rating 30 days into a deployment without a baseline? As 30 days into deployment is likely to have already been a major change from participants’ real baseline and is likely to mask the change which we are looking for.

-

Stats section

- What does “by-symptom” mean? Is this a typo?
- Which correlation coefficients were used? Please list them here.
- Why look for convergence “question by question”? would it not be better to look overall as the questions are not individually validated? A difficulty associated with looking for convergence “question by question” is that you would need to match individual questions. There was no reference made to how this was achieved.
- I would like to hear more about the construction of the log regression model here and what was included? What symptoms were used?

Results

- 860 recruited, R1-248, R2 128, R3 62. Very low response rate!
- What does the term “low response rates mean”? are the authors referring to “non response to these questions or low ratings on these questions? Please clarify.

Psychometric properties

- Again I would like to have heard more about what was included in the regression model for “PTSD caseness”.

Discussion

- How was sampling error a limitation here?

Table 1.

Why are questions 5, 14 and 15 highlighted? Was this the case for the version completed by study raters?

Table 2

-How can the standard deviation be larger than the mean score?