



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 76286

Title: Associations between social support and anxiety during the COVID-19 lockdown in young and middle-aged Israelis: A cross-sectional study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06149620

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Israel

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-12 05:41

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-12 17:22

Review time: 11 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 Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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

This is a fine paper based on a fine database. However, there are some limitations both in the way the paper is written and in the data analyses. 1. "Snow ball" is not the professional term for the manner of data collection described. It should state convenience sampling with additional limitations for generalization of results when using this method. A reference on convenience sampling compared to other methods is required. 2. In the data analysis I missed the used of the correction for multiple comparisons. This is important since the use adjusted and non-adjusted models is not justified in the text and seems like trying to get significance anyway you can get it. 3. Line 56: I do not agree with the sentence. Social support is significantly important always not just for individuals with "heavy burden". See works by Miculincer and Shaver. 4. Line 58: social support is not a simple source for many individuals and I fail to understand what is "simpler" about this social support which is a complex developmentally based and inherent in human evolution process. See works on loneliness during the COVID by Gil Zalsman. 5. Line 65: did the authors mean inverse correlation? 6. Line 70: this sentence should be one of the highlights of this study. 7. Line 74: not correct. Please conduct a literature search. 8. Line 91: what do the authors mean in the term with the word shelter? Is it connected to the COVID or to a war situation in Israel? This is not a term I find in the immense COVID mental health literature. 9. Limitations on generalization to younger and older ages should be included. 10. Line 138: why two tailed if the hypothesis as it arises from- although not stated clearly in, the introduction, in one-tailed? 11. Line 160: were questions on the COVID situation and being infected or exposed to infected individuals included in the survey? If



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

not, this should be stated in the limitations. 12. The paper requires careful editing and proof reading. There are many typos and extra spaces. 13. Line 187: not true. Please conduct a literature search. 14. 204: The meaning of this sentence is unclear. 15. Line 208: the term protective is misleading as it implies causality which is not the case in this study. 16. Lines 210-229: how this paragraph relates to the results of the current study? Make a concluding statement following all these citations. 17. Line 239: not true. Please conduct a reliable literature search. 18. Finally, line 247: not true. See Ferber et al, in Anxiety Stress and Coping, Ferber et al, in Frontiers in Psychiatry.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 76286

Title: Associations between social support and anxiety during the COVID-19 lockdown in young and middle-aged Israelis: A cross-sectional study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06251480

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ethiopia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-10 12:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-17 07:39

Review time: 6 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the Author I have read the article with a great interest since it focuses on a timely societal issue and I do recognize that this manuscript provides an information on associations between social support and anxiety. Despite the fact that this work was written based on the feedback of two reviewers, I believe there are certain flaws in the manuscript that should be corrected after a thorough revision. The following are the points that the authors need to heed thoroughly before to consider the paper for potential publication in the journal:

Title: Associations between social support and anxiety during the COVID-19 Lockdown in young and middle-aged Israelis: a cross-sectional study

Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? No

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes Specific comments Abstract Background: - Acronyms need to be written in full form the first time, and given short form in parenthesis, after that, you can use them consistently. - Line 23.... COVID-19 lockdown...correct as Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) - Line 28...." A total of 655 individuals aged 26–47 years took part in the present study". Introduction -Line 45" Coronavirus 19 (COVID-19) ... correct like Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) - Please include hypothesis to be tested Methods and



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

material -Line 87..." The responses to the questionnaire were collected over an eight-day period from April 19 to May 2, 2020, when...." The time frame "April 19 to May 2" exceeds 8 days please correctly specify exact time. -Line 96... "A total of 655 participants aged 26-47 took part". - Why author used age class of 26-47 only? As mentioned on the title, interest is those at young and middle age, hence author should correct this statement. I recommend this should be correct as "A total of 655 participants took part in current study" - Line 97-98..." Participants who failed to complete all the questionnaires were excluded." How many respondents declined to complete the survey or provided incomplete information? Please specify response rate. -

Line 107-108...." with scores ranging from 0 to 21, where ≥ 5 , ≥ 10 and ≥ 15 represent mild, moderate and severe anxiety symptoms, respectively. Please specify categories and corresponding cut point correctly. I recommend to correct as "... with scores ranging from 0 to 21. These scores represent 0-4 (minimal anxiety), 5-9(mild anxiety), 10-14 (moderate anxiety), and 15-21 (severe anxiety)." - Line 111-116 please provide categories and outpoint for social support Assessment tool of "Multidimensional Perceived Social Support Scale (MSPSS)". - Line 132-134... "The MSPSS scores were graded by quartile (quartile: ≥ 75 th percentile, quartile: ≥ 50 th to 75th percentile, quartile 2: ≥ 25 th to 50th percentile, quartile 1: < 25 th percentile)." This sentence not clear. Please correctly write ranges for quartile. Results - Line 151...title 3.2. "The MSPSS was associated with the GAD-7 score" should be re-written. Giving conclusion on title is not usual. I recommend "3.2 Association of MSPSS with the GAD-7 score" - Line 161... "3.3. The MSPSS was associated with anxiety" correct similarly as previous one. Discussion - Well written and organized. - Please discuss the following important related works, seems they are missing:

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12991-022-00385-3>

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19371918.2020.1808144> Additional comments - To make



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

acronyms and/or abbreviations easier to understand for the reader, a list of acronyms and/or abbreviations should be mentioned. - Please provide questionnaire (implemented in this study) as supplementary material.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 76286

Title: Associations between social support and anxiety during the COVID-19 lockdown in young and middle-aged Israelis: A cross-sectional study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06251480

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ethiopia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-10

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-02 14:08

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-03 09:49

Review time: 19 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Since authors fully addressed all comments raised. I recommend the paper for publication.