

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 16608

Title: So if we like the idea of peer support workers, why aren't we seeing more?

Reviewer's code: 00723721

Reviewer's country: Afghanistan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-02-01 17:45

Date reviewed: 2015-02-10 18:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript "So if we like the idea of peer workers, why aren't we seeing more?" is an original piece of work which reflects the current state of the 'peer workers' in Scotland, the degree of inclusion in the health system, and subjective views and opinions of individuals with responsibility in the policy and management of health systems. This later assessment is especially interesting, since it is not the usual case; it provides additional information to the more 'objective' parameters, such as the effectiveness, which in fact may be crucial to understand the barriers to the implementation of this new approach. The manuscript is well developed and well written (from an assessment based on what scientific language should be). The subject is interesting and contemporary, and it is based on sound experience and knowledge. Having said this, I have one major remark regarding an important idea which the authors express, which, in my opinion and recommendation, should be reconsidered and reformulated: In several parts of the manuscript, the authors claim that "the use of peer workers is an indication of services' commitment to recovery principles and approaches", "and therefore provides a useful lens to reflect on how serious services are about recovery more generally and how services might be encouraged and supported to become more

recovery-focused". This assumption seems biased and not appropriately supported. The reasons for my disagreement are: - To my knowledge, there is no evidence that the 'peer workers' approach leads to recovery, or leads to recovery in a higher percentage of patients than other conventional approaches. - The authors seem to put the 'peer workers' approach in the centre of it all. To put it in another words, the fact that a health system has not incorporated the 'peer workers' approach does not mean that this health system does not consider 'recovery' as a core aim. It just means that "that" approach has not been considered to be sufficiently effective (or cost – effective) to develop it. Currently there is more and more awareness of the importance to achieve recovery, but the ways to attain it are diverse (including pharmacological, psychotherapeutic and psychosocial interventions) and multidisciplinary. Therefore, the use or not of the 'peer workers' approach cannot be claimed as an equivalent or proxy of the interest of the health systems to achieve recovery. This idea - assumption is expressed in several parts of the manuscript: - Abstract: ... '...and a greater overall recovery coherence' - Introduction: 'We argue that...' - Reflections: First paragraph: 'We have argued that...' and last paragraph 'We would argue that...' Regarding this issue, the sentence beginning with 'Within this context, the development of peer workers role has been consistently identified as...' (page 5) is more acceptable, since it could be an indicator of the willingness to achieve recovery, but not the contrary, given the wide range of available interventions, with greater evidence supporting them. There is also a typo which the authors should revise and correct: - Page 3: 'renegotiated' begins in lowercase after a dot.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 16608

Title: So if we like the idea of peer support workers, why aren't we seeing more?

Reviewer's code: 02445294

Reviewer's country: Norway

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-02-01 17:45

Date reviewed: 2015-02-12 20:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

You are obviously highly engaged with and convinced about the impact of peer workers. According to my understanding of the problem this causes a somehow biased view. However, this might sometimes be necessary. As far as I am familiar with the literature, the evidence for the effectiveness of such peer workers is not overwhelmingly convincing. And, of course, it is difficult to define and find consensus for criteria indicating effects. However, just one question. Aren't processes in self-help groups based on the same background? Nevertheless, I just some formal concerns. You should include the information of the contribution of each author on the title page. Furthermore, a 'Conflict of interest' statement is missing. The applied reference style is not according to the instructions. It looks a bit lengthy for an Editorial. But, I don't have a good idea where to cut something. In case that you find bits that are not really necessary to deliver your message, please try to shorten the manuscript somewhat. minor concerns: p. 3, last paragr., last sentence should start with a big letter p. 4, 2nd paragr. - please delete 1x 'they' p. 5, end of 1st paragr. - please give a reference for this statement p. 11, 4th paragr. - please delete one 'that' (1st row)

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 16608

Title: So if we like the idea of peer support workers, why aren't we seeing more?

Reviewer's code: 02445298

Reviewer's country: Slovenia

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-02-01 17:45

Date reviewed: 2015-02-14 01:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear dr. Lian-Sheng Ma, President and Company Editor-in-Chief, The article "So if we like the idea of peer workers, why aren't we seeing more?" I can recommend for a publication in WJP. The topic is quite novel and interesting for a regular reader. The paper needs minor changes. Methods: the authors should add a brief description of the Scottish Mental Health system as it is not well known to a regular reader. Research findings: it is not clear which kind of patients were interviewed – patients with remission or patients with symptoms of illness. Where there any differences? What kind of treatment did the patients have?