PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 65305

Title: Psychoeducation in bipolar disorder: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 05175942

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-10 15:22

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-17 01:18

Review time: 6 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the Author： Thanks for the opportunity for me to review the article entitled "psychoeducation in bipolar disorder: a systematic review. "The authors conducted a systematic review to explore whether psychoeducation interventions for patients as well as their relatives can make a difference in some aspects, such as reduction in frequency of new mood episodes, the length of hospital stay and so on. These findings may bring good news to bipolar disorder patients. However, there are some severe weaknesses that can be modified. Below I provide both broad and specific comments with the hope that this paper will be improved in the next submission. 1. Abstract: for the methods part of the abstract, authors have no description of the literature database at all. This part can be written with more details. 2. Introduction: Overall, the content of introduction is not comprehensive enough. Additionally, the amount of literature included is not enough, either. Therefore, it would be better if the author could write it again with these below suggestions. For the first paragraph of introduction, there is no description of therapy for bipolar disorder, with no mention of psychoeducation. For the second paragraph, we do not know whether there are some other similar reviews about psychoeducation for bipolar disorders or not. If they do exist, the author should show us the better part of his own review compared with currently published articles (Psychoeducation for relapse prevention in bipolar disorder: a systematic review of efficacy in randomized controlled trials. Bond K, Anderson IM). The author should explain the reason that meta-analysis was unable to be performed. Or, just include no meta analysis into limitations part. The last paragraph poorly explains the purpose of psychoeducational interventions to relatives of patients, and readers may be confused about it. 3. Methods: in terms of review methods, "there were no date restriction criteria." This sentence can be written more clearly. 4. Methods:the authors has searched too few literature database. Please conduct the literature searching again

with more database. 5. Methods: "The systematic review has been registered in the international Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) registration number: CRD42020168910." Maybe this sentence can be placed at the top of the methods part. 6. Result: at the part of characterization of included studies, author should give us the reasons why non-randomized articles are included. 7. Result: The statistical indexes which can reflect the results of psychoeducation programs are needed. Please try to provide the quantitative outcome as possible. 8. Discussion: for the limitation part, author should add some contents such as the limitation that meta-analysis was unable to be performed. 9. Reference: The format of reference is not united. 10. It is about format of figure and table. The "="sign in Figure 1 should be preceded by a space. In Table 1, there is extra space before the year. For example, "Wiener et al., 2017", an extra space was placed before the year 2017. It should be deleted. Table 3 and Table 4 lack space before year.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 65305

Title: Psychoeducation in bipolar disorder: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 00551176

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Hungary

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-03

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-08 13:29

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-19 15:00

Review time: 11 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] 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) [ ] 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

Rabelo JL et al.: Psychoeducation in Bipolar disorder: a systematic review   This is a systematic review of studies evaluating the effect of psychoeducation in bipolar disorder. Unique feature of the review, that not only papers published in English, but also papers published in Portuguese were included. Nevertheless I could identify only one Portuguese paper in the list of references (Ref 74). Further value of this review, that it gives a detailed analysis about the effectiveness of different psychoeducation modalities. Conclusions are based on the results and limitations are correctly listed. Comments to improve the quality of the manuscript: The title: List of References should be in English.   Description of studies and Figure 1: the subchapter, as well as the flow chart is hard to follow. The aim of this subchapter and flow chart is to demonstrate how the initial group of publications was condensed to the final group included in the analysis. But the steps of this process are not evident from the text and the chart. Please correct it! In the description of studies part authors mention 45 included publications and then in the next paragraph 36 included clinical studies. As duplications were excluded, I ask authors to explain this discrepancy.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 65305

Title: Psychoeducation in bipolar disorder: A systematic review

Reviewer's code: 05175942

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-03

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-19 15:14

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-19 15:20

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] 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 statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author have already solved all the problems.