PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 74350

Title: Dimensions of emotional distress among Brazilian workers in a COVID-19 reference hospital: A factor analytical study

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05333882

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACP, MBBS

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-22 17:36

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-22 18:05

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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Peer review: Authors describe observational data with regards to emotional stress in Brazilian population.   Major comments: Total invites 22,056, final response 1377, included in analysis 1000 only. Very poor response rate. Not sure if the results from survey with a response rate of 4.5% is really representative to draw any meaningful conclusions Due to the low response rate, there is also a risk of selection and response bias. Not sure if authors can do anything about it but it should clearly be states as one of the limitations.   Need more information about collinearity and confounding. Please provide VIFs for the test of collinearity.   Results can be described in the main text with highlighting the salient findings without extensive details of statistical analysis (that could be included as a supplement).   With regards to running multiple models in the analysis, was there a Bonferroni adjustment for the P value? Needs to be explicitly mentioned in the text.   Was the past history of psychological/psychiatric treatment associated with higher rates of stress/depression or higher score on PHQ?   Overall well done study: General acceptance

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] 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

I accepted this manuscript for publication after minor revisions: 1-Introduction and background:I need from the authors to give us more data about the other Hospitals in Brazil to compare between their Hospital and others in the same country 2-In results section ,the authors wrote in the 1st paragraph "most of ...."„we must avoid these words in results illustration ,we just write the percentage only   3-In methodology section: the authors have to explain more the site of medical staff like in ER„,COVID-19 ICU„,because this have a burden on the HCWs 4-In Discussion section:The authors have to explain more about the duration of the institutional support„it was just during the acute phase only because all of us know that we have now the concept of Chronic COVID-19 sequale. -I declare no conflict of interst about this manuscript and this is the 1st time to review it .