

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 83382

Title: Psychiatrists' Occupational Stigma Conceptualization, Measurement and Intervention: A Literature Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

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: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-18 07:35

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-26 08:32

Review time: 8 Days

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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

Shi X-L et al.: Psychiatrists' Occupational Stigma Conceptualization, Measurement and Intervention: A Literature Review This is a narrative review of psychiatrists' occupational stigma. The topic is relevant and actual, worth for the attention of the readers. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. The abstract appropriately summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. Key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. The manuscript covers all relevant issues regarding occupational stigma. Authors start with the description of the concept, then discuss measurement tools, and intervention strategies. The manuscript highlights the importance of the field and the existing gaps in research thus contributes to the research progress of the field. In the discussion authors interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The discussion is accurate, authors discuss the paper's relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. Tables are sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative. The manuscript appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. The style, language and



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

grammar accurate and appropriate.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 83382

Title: Psychiatrists' Occupational Stigma Conceptualization, Measurement and Intervention: A Literature Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05688164

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MD, PhD

Professional title: Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Hungary

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-14 07:00

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-17 11:30

Review time: 3 Days and 4 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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: <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

17 March 2023 Manuscript ID: 83382 Type: Review Title: 'Psychiatrists Occupational Stigma Conceptualization, Measurement and Intervention: A Literature Review' by Shi et al., submitted to World Journal of Psychiatry Dear Authors, Shi and colleagues in the present review entitled 'Psychiatrists' Occupational Stigma Conceptualization, Measurement and Intervention: A Literature Review', reviewed the related literature on psychiatrists' occupational stigma and aimed to further clarify its concept, measurement tools, and intervention strategies. The results of this study provided a theoretical foundation for measuring occupational stigma toward and among psychiatrists, and for developing interventions for psychiatrists. The authors concluded by stating that this work can draw attention to psychiatrists' occupational stigma, thereby reducing it and promoting the development of psychiatry and the construction of a professional psychiatric workforce. The main strength of this manuscript is that it addresses an interesting and timely question, providing a captivating interpretation and describing psychiatrists' occupational stigma, and focusing on effective interventions by reviewing related literature widely and deeply. In general, I think the idea of this review is really



**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

interesting and the authors' fascinating observations on this timely topic may be of interest to the readers of World Journal of Psychiatry. However, some comments, as well as some crucial evidence that should be included to support the authors' argumentation, needed to be addressed to improve the quality of the manuscript, its adequacy, and its readability prior to the publication in the present form. My overall opinion is to publish this paper after the authors have carefully considered my suggestions below. Please consider the following comments: 1. Abstract: Also, in my opinion, Authors should consider rephrasing this section. According to the Journal's guidelines, the Abstract should contain most of the following kinds of information in brief form. Please, consider giving a more synthetic overview of the paper's key points: I would suggest rephrasing the results and conclusion to make them clear for readers to understand. I would like the authors to focus on proportionally presenting the background including the objectives, the short summary, and the conclusion without subheadings. The background should include the general background (one to two sentences), the specific background (two to three sentences), and current issue addressed to this study (one sentence), leading to the objectives. The short summary should close with one to two sentences which put the body of manuscript into a more general context. The conclusion should include one sentence describing the main message using such words like "Here we highlight". The conclusion should write the potential and the advance this study has provided in the field and finally a broader perspective (two to three sentences) readily comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline. 2. I would ask the Authors to clarify the criteria they decided to use for studies' collection in their review: they should specify the number of studies included in the review and the requirements used to decide whether a study met the inclusion/exclusion criteria of the review; they also should provide a more detailed description of all other variables for which data were sought, and briefly present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. 3. The objectives of this study are generally clear

and to the point; however, I believe that there are some ambiguous points that require clarification or refining. I think that authors here need to be explicit regarding how they operationally investigated the concept of psychiatrists' occupational stigma, since this is the key aim of this review.

4. THE MEASUREMENT OF PSYCHIATRISTS' OCCUPATIONAL STIGMA: In this section, authors focused on describing measurement tools can be used to gauge public stigma toward psychiatrists. In this regard, I would suggest to also focus on describing also psychiatrists' stigmatising attitudes and perceptions of stigma towards stress and burnout in their work: that would be useful to further develop a reliable measure of stigma of occupational stress and burnout among psychiatrists.

5. Discussion: In this final section, authors described the results of their study and their argumentation and captured the state of the art well; however, I would have liked to see some views on a way forward. I believe that the authors should make their effort, trying to explain the theoretical implication as well as the translational application of this paper, to adequately convey what they believe is the take-home message of their study. In this regard, I believe that it would be necessary to discuss theoretical and methodological avenues in need of refinement, as well as suggestions of a path forward in understanding the evidence for psychiatrists' occupational stigma in mental-health-care settings. Indeed, recent research have suggested educational interventions that could be effective in decreasing stigma especially for general health-care professionals with little or no formal mental health training: in my opinion, it would be very useful to deepen information about the effects of stigma on mental health professionals, by worsening, undermining, or impeding a number of processes, including social relationships, resource availability, and psychological (DOI: 10.3390/ijms24044114; DOI: 10.3390/biomedicines10122999) and behavioral responses (<https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2022.998714>; DOI: 10.3390/cells11162607), exacerbating their own stress and burnout that could lead to the development of mental health

disorders (<https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines10123189>;
<https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines10081897>). 6. In my opinion, although not
mandatory, I believe that a proper and defined 'Conclusions' paragraph would be useful
here to properly convey some thoughtful as well as in-depth considerations by the
authors. The authors should make their effort to explain the theoretical implication as
well as the translational application of their research. 7. In according to the previous
comment, I would ask the authors to include a proper 'Limitations and future directions'
section before the end of the manuscript, in which authors can describe in detail and
report all the technical issues brought to the surface. 8. I suggest submitting your work
to an English native speaker to help with some grammar mistakes that can be found in
different sections of the manuscript. Overall, the manuscript contains four tables and 181
references. I believe that this manuscript might carry important value in describing
psychiatrists' occupational stigma and the related concepts, measurements, and
interventions. I hope that, after these careful revisions, the manuscript can meet the
Journal's high standards for publication. I am available for a new round of revision of
this review. I declare no conflict of interest regarding this manuscript. Best regards,
Reviewer