



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 88146

Title: Cognitive dissonance and mind-set perturbations during crisis -
“eco-socio-psycho-somatic” perspectives

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 03656595

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: Austria

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-12

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-25 10:59

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-26 10:30

Review time: 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Baishideng Publishing Group

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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 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 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

The interesting field of vision covers all issues and details regarding the cognitive dissonance and mind-set perturbations during crisis. I have nothing to comment.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 88146

Title: Cognitive dissonance and mind-set perturbations during crisis -
“eco-socio-psycho-somatic” perspectives

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 02445242

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MAMS, MBBS, MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: India

Author’s Country/Territory: Austria

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-12

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-29 05:59

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-01 07:06

Review time: 2 Days and 1 Hour

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 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 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 manuscript provides a very interesting perspective on the pandemic and its psychosocial consequences. The integration of cognitive (cognitive dissonance) with psychoanalytic (object relations) and social theories (information communication) was quite unique. However, the authors must acknowledge that they are using many different concepts/theories that the average reader might not be familiar with. Therefore, they might to have explain certain concepts in more detail. For example, I found the ‘Abstract’ somewhat difficult to understand because there were too many terms & phrases such as ‘perspective of a multidimensional multi-level social-ecological theoretical framework, which as a multi-optional heuristic reference model and related to other ecological approaches’, which were not very clear in the first instance. In contrast, the main text was easier to understand because the concepts were elaborated upon and explained more clearly. However, if readers find the abstract too difficult, they may not be interested in the rest of the manuscript. Therefore, the authors may have to rewrite the ‘Abstract’ to make it simpler to understand. Moreover, throughout the manuscript the authors have used terms such as ‘infodemic’, ‘cancel culture’, ‘spiral of



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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

silence', 'big reset', 'situated individuals' often without elaborating what these terms mean. Similarly, parts like - 'This fragmented character of the socio-cultural environment in turn favors the individual development of "dissociated personalities" and thus in this "fragmented acceleration society " a fundamental "loss of (coherent) resonance" of the individuals [8] arises. in relation to borderline personality disorder, narcissism and identity and authenticity [9,10,11].' - are difficult to comprehend.

I would suggest another box on the lines of box 1 to provide brief definitions of all these new terms. Finally, although the authors propose a number of mechanisms to explain the psychosocial repercussions of the pandemic, it is not clear if any of these causal theories were examined during the pandemic either in the general population or among patients with mental illnesses. In fact, there is a distinct lack of evidence, which could support (or refute) their proposals. This becomes important, because according to the authors' guidelines, a 'field of vision' article should include 'recent perspectives of seminal articles, on hot topic articles, or the latest articles in the research field in order to keep readers at the forefront of research and increase the impact of their clinical research'.