

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 89213

Title: Mediating role of social support in relationships between dysphoria, despondency,

and quality of life in patients undergoing maintenance hemodialysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07916040

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-05 08:56

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-12 08:39

Review time: 6 Days and 23 Hours

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair</li> <li>[ ] Grade D: No novelty</li> </ul>
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent       [Y] Grade B: Good       [] Grade C: Fair         [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



# Baishideng

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	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair</li> <li>[ ] Grade D: No scientific significance</li> </ul>
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

MHD is an enduring and often lifelong therapy for patients with ESKD. This frequently results in a range of psychological challenges for patients. Numerous studies have demonstrated a high prevalence of psychological disorders in patients undergoing MHD, with dysphoria and despondency being particularly prevalent. In this manuscript, Zhou X et al conducted an observational study on the mediating role of social support in relationships between dysphoria, despondency and quality of life in patients undergoing MHD. 1- Title reflected the main subject of the manuscript. 2- The abstract summarized and reflect the described in the manuscript. 3- The manuscript adequately described the background, presented status and significance of the study. 4- The manuscript described Materials and methods (e.g., Subjects, Research Tools, Data Collection, Statistical analysis, etc.) in adequate detail. 5- The research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study. 6- The manuscript interpreted the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. 7-Manuscript included sufficient, good quality Tables. 8- The manuscript cited appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and



discussion sections. 9- The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented and the style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriated.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 89213

Title: Mediating role of social support in relationships between dysphoria, despondency,

and quality of life in patients undergoing maintenance hemodialysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07916027

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Dean

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Portugal

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-04 10:53

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-15 05:43

Review time: 10 Days and 18 Hours

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 [ ] Grade B: Good [ Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair</li> <li>[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation</li> </ul>



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	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority)</li> <li>[ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ Y] Minor revision</li> <li>[ ] Major revision</li> <li>[ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
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 used a random sampling approach to select 289 patients undergoing MHD between January and December 2022. Using correlation analysi to examine the associations between social support, dysphoria, despondency, and the QOL in patients undergoing MHD, They found that social support plays a significant mediating role in the relationship between dysphoria, despondency, and QOL in patients undergoing MHD. Very interesting study. And the manuscript is well written. The experiment of the study is designed very well, aims are very clear. Methods are reasonable. Data in tables are very good, and well discussed. I would suggest it publish in WJP if the authors can address the following concerns. 1. Table 6 is not mentioned in the main text. 2. It is recommended to add a table to describe the demographic information of enrolled MHD patients, such as gender and age. 3. The last two lines on page 8 "The total social support scores obtained from the 289 patients undergoing MHD ranged from 13 to 60" Where did the data from 13 to 60 come from? I did not get the information from Table 1. 4. There are some data that need to be reconfirmed, such as: In Effects of social support on distress "... 52 (range, 42-65)" is inconsistent with the data in Table 3. In Effects of social



support on QOL "... median score of 69 and..." is inconsistent with the data in Table 4; In Effects of social support on QOL "Conversely, the lowest score was found in the emotional function dimension" is inconsistent with the data in Table 4. Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to review.