



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 89182

Title: Optimization of nursing interventions for postoperative mental status recovery in patients with cerebral hemorrhage

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 07746709

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Researcher

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Norway

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-22 08:46

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-30 08:17

Review time: 7 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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

HCH is the most common chronic diseases, it has become a topic of global public health discussions. The authors conducted this randomized controlled trial to investigate the role of rehabilitative nursing interventions in optimizing the postoperative mental status recovery phase. This provided clinical value for future rehabilitation of patients with cerebral hemorrhage. On the whole, the authors have analyzed the relevant data of patients with cerebral hemorrhage and have done a lot of work, but the manuscript also needs to be carefully checked by the authors. I have some minor remarks: 1. The description of "5 self-evaluation item" in Pittsburgh sleep quality index is incorrect; according to the reviewer, it should be "5 others review projects". 2. It is suggested that observation group be uniformly described in the full text, and interventions group are now used in some places. 3. Table 3 was not cited in the text. 4. At the end of the article, the Research methods of ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS needs to be re-checked. Thanks



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 89182

Title: Optimization of nursing interventions for postoperative mental status recovery in patients with cerebral hemorrhage

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 06521481

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Ghana

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-27 05:42

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-30 09:52

Review time: 3 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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

The authors analyzed 120 patients with postoperative hypertensive cerebral hemorrhage postoperative hypertensive admitted between May 2021 and May 2023 using simple random sampling. The results of this randomized controlled trial showed that quality nursing interventions have an optimizing effect on the psychological state of patients with cerebral hemorrhage, which can significantly improve the psychological state of patients, promote the recovery of their consciousness, and increase nursing satisfaction and improve the doctor-patient relationship. This topic is actual and well described. The manuscript is well written and very interesting, and authors presented also the limitations of the study. I have only one question: I noted that the study used Simple random sampling. Why not use block randomization? As far as I know, block randomization has many advantages over simple randomization.