PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 76299

Title: Does COVID-19 related symptomatology indicate a transdiagnostic neuropsychiatric disorder? - Multidisciplinary implications

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06245556

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DPhil

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Australia

Author's Country/Territory: Israel

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-11 10:05

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-11 10:40

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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

The authors have constructed a compelling hypothesis for the instigation of clinical diagnoses relating to stress- and infection-related psychiatric disease associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. This is a pertinent issue and warrants an editorial - indeed, one would hope that, as time passes, "long-COVID" will be replaced by more accurate diagnoses related to the psychiatric symptomology. Overall, the editorial is clear and well written. The authors could add a further paragraph which more specifically describes how the new diagnoses serve to benefit the individual - e.g. what might the implications be for treatment in Type A vs. Type B? I understand that these diagnoses are not mutually exclusive, though a dichotomy certainly would exist for example in younger vs. older individuals.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] 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

The authors have called this manuscript an editorial. It addresses an important topic e.g. the many medical and psychosocial aspects and components of COVID-19 and its aftermath, which is appropriate for an editorial. However, I think an editorial should be shorter and crisper. My recommendation would be that the authors turn this into a review paper and include a Method section (how they selected their studies, what questions they were asking) and a Table that clearly shows the various aspects they are discussing. That should not be difficult to do. The English is not perfect - it could benefit by a closed review by a native speaker.