PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 82917

Title: Relationship between social support perceived and post-traumatic growth by coronavirus patients discharged from the hospital

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06307016

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-30 05:52

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-07 01:46

Review time: 7 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled "The Relationship Between the Level of Social Support Perceived and Post-traumatic Growth by Coronavirus Patients Discharged from the Hospital" (Manuscript NO: 82917) examined an interesting and useful question through the analysis of empirical data collected in Turkey. The research aim is clear and the methods adopted are appropriate. The findings are useful. I suggest some improvements.   (1) In the title, "the level of "could be removed, and"social support perceived" could be changed to "perceived social support".   (2) In the section of introduction (p2), except for the definition of "social support", the definition of "perceived social support" and the difference between "social support" and "perceived social support" can be given.   (3) In the section of research questions (p3), "post-traumatic stress" in question 2 was not consistent with "post-traumatic growth", which was discussed in the section of introduction. Moreover, the manuscript did not mention

the measurement of "post-traumatic stress".   (4) The time of the study described in page 3 ("between August and December, 2022") was not consistent with that stated in abstract (p1, "between August and September 2022").   (5) As a cross-sectional study, it is not appropriate to make causal statements about the relationship between the study variables. Meanwhile, the cross-sectional research design can be considered as a limitation of this study, which can be discussed in the section of limitations.   (6) About the section of limitations, first, it is not organized well; second, it can be integrated into the section of discussion; third, research suggestions for future studies could be provided based on the limitations of the present study.   (7) In the section of results, "Stress level of the patients during the pandemic process was found to be between 7.14 ± 2.58 (between 0 and 10)" (p5), "stress level of the patients during the pandemic process" suggests that the stress level is not the "post-traumatic stress" in research question 2; meanwhile, how the stress level of the patients during the pandemic process was measured is a question. Related measurement method and details should be added. (8) About the level of perceived social support and post-traumatic growth, criteria for judgment should be provided first, otherwise, readers may ask how to determine that "the patients have a good level of perceived social support" (p6) or "a bad level"? or how to determine that "In this study, it was found that the individuals had moderate PTG" (p7)?   (9) In the section of discussion, some statements such as "In addition to the support of family members, patients also receive support from the health system, such as education and counselling. All these services may have played an important role in the formation of perceived social support." (pp6-7) lack empirical evidences. In other words, the section of methods and the section of results did not provide relevant information.   (10) In the section of discussion, "Another remarkable finding is that the most significant growth in PTG was in the spiritual sub-dimension (Table 3)."(p8) In fact, information in Table 3 cannot support this statement.   (11) Theoretical and

practical implications of the findings of this study are insufficient, which should be discussed in the section of discussion.   (12) In addition, there are still several mistakes of language expression in this manuscript, which should be modified and polished.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 82917

Title: Relationship between social support perceived and post-traumatic growth by coronavirus patients discharged from the hospital

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06419455

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-08 03:31

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-08 05:11

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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

1.Why is there a relationship between social support perceived and post-traumatic growth? Is there a theoretical underpinning? 2.It is suggested that "Limitations of the Study " be included in the discussion section. 3. Why was the study conducted on patients who had been discharged from hospital for three months? Is there any basis for this? 4. The research methodology is somewhat simple. Is it possible to dig deeper into the data? 5. What is the future direction of the subject matter described in this paper? What issues remain to be addressed?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 82917

Title: Relationship between social support perceived and post-traumatic growth by coronavirus patients discharged from the hospital

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06419455

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-29

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-28 02:31

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-01 09:00

Review time: 1 Day and 6 Hours

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	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

After revision, the paper has been greatly improved. There is, however, one problem that is not well addressed. In the introduction, from perceived social support to post-traumatic growth, not only the support of existing researches, but also the corresponding theories or models about perceived social support should be added.