



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 29639

Title: Reliability and validity of an instrument to measure the attitudes of psychiatric patients towards involuntary admission: Attitudes Towards Involuntary Admission

Reviewer's code: 02445298

Reviewer's country: Slovenia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-09-30

Date reviewed: 2016-10-19

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article "The development and psychometric assessment of an instrument to measure the perceptions of psychiatric patients to involuntary hospitalization" I cannot recommend for a publication in WJP. The topic is interesting, but it is not novel. It represents well known facts. The paper is difficult to read and needs a lot of changes regarding more explanation of results. It needs changes in interpretations of results and explanations before publication: Abstract The conclusion has any relevant message for the reader and is not the result of the method, the results are missing. Introduction What about the involuntary admission of manic, suicidal demented patients and patients with delirium? The introduction needs some data about laws differences. Discussion Page 12, 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th paragraphs: these are the introduction data and do not have a clear correlation with author findings Page 14, 1st paragraph: the topic needs explanation what was the purpose of a study and what is the theoretical and special practical value of a study. Overall The paper is not novel, authors confirm previous



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

data as for example on page 13 paragraph 1 and 2. The authors conclude that the study is an instrument to measure patients' perceptions towards involuntary hospitalization was developed but this conclusion was not discussed in discussion. The authors have missed the point. I cannot find a practical value of a ATIA scale for researcher or clinical practitioner.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 29639

Title: Reliability and validity of an instrument to measure the attitudes of psychiatric patients towards involuntary admission: Attitudes Towards Involuntary Admission

Reviewer's code: 02445225

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-09-30

Date reviewed: 2016-10-24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<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 highly relevant paper dealing with the assessment of patient satisfaction in the case of involuntary admission. The authors developed a questionnaire that seems well constructed and useful. Assessment of the properties of the questionnaire results in a plausible three factor solution. The authors state correctly that involuntary admission varies considerably from country to country or even from district to district with a strong interaction between law and attitude of the psychiatrists involved. To interpret the presented findings it would be helpful to get an impression where Calgary stands in that continuum. The developed questionnaire should unfold its relevance in an international multi-center study. Perhaps it would be relevant to have also a questionnaire assessing psychiatrist attitude towards involuntary admission. There are several writing errors (pages 8 and 10) that should be eliminated. The first sentence on page 9 is problematic because it remains unclear what should be compared to what.