ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry
ESPS manuscript NO: 24227
Title: Path analysis of the relationship among personality, perceived stress, coping, social support, psychological outcomes
Reviewer's code: 02445219
Reviewer's country: Germany
Science editor: Shui Qiu
Date sent for review: 2016-01-15 13:49
Date reviewed: 2016-01-22 21:31

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors are examing a hot and interesting topic. However, the manuscript needs a major revision in form and content and there is a lot of work to performe to make the manuscript readable: 1. In the methods and result part of the mansucript some information must be given about the sample and the questionaires which were used. How where the results? The same is true for the results section. Not one single questionaire is mentioned. 2. I have never read an abstract before where two sentences began with "so" 3. The core tips have no impact at all. 4. The tables should have the same form. 5. The language needs major revision.   The figures are nice.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

COMMENTS FOR AUTHORS   INTRODUCTION   Firstly, the authors must clearly state that they are intending to examine the effects of psychological stress and its interactions with personality, perceived intensity of stressors, coping and social support in determining negative psychological outcomes such as anxiety or depression.   Secondly, I assume that they are basing their study on the transactional model of Lazarus & Folkman, but this is not clearly stated or referred to in the introduction.   There are several ways to classify coping strategies, active and avoidance coping being only one of them. The authors need to mention why they chose this particular typology and not for instance the Lazarus classification of problem- and emotion- focused strategies.   Similarly, the effects of social support are often distinguished between a main or direct effect or the buffering effect. This quote from an article by Cohen & Wills, Psychological Bulletin, 1985 explains the distinction: "The purpose of this article is to determine whether the positive association between social support and well-being is attributable more to an overall beneficial effect of support (main- or direct-effect model) or to a process of support protecting persons from potentially adverse effects of stressful

events (buffering model). The review concludes that there is evidence consistent with both models. Evidence for a buffering model is found when the social support measure assesses the perceived availability of interpersonal resources that are responsive to the needs elicited by stressful events. Evidence for a main effect model is found when the support measure assesses a person's degree of integration in a large social network." The authors need to incorporate these concepts their discussion on the effects of social support (both in the introduction and the discussion sections). The authors mention the effects of personality traits, coping and social support, but the reference to perceived intensity of stressors is very brief. This concept and its role need to be elaborated because it might be somewhat unfamiliar concept for many readers. It also brings in the concepts of appraisal and self-efficacy as mediating variables. Understandably, these were not examined in this study. Finally, the introduction should ideally end with the stated objectives and a guiding hypothesis for the study.   MATERIALS AND METHOD   The major issue I have with this section is that I cannot understand the authors' choice of some of the instruments. For some dimensions they appear to have used scales, which are not standard ones, e.g. the Stressful Life Events Questionnaire. The authors need to explain why they chose this scale over standard SLE inventories. How was this scale different from the usual self-report inventories in measuring the perceived intensity of stress? Similarly it is not clear why the authors chose to use the HADS, which is meant more for a clinical population than a community sample? Why did they restrict the negative psychological outcomes to only depression and anxiety, and not choose a broader measure of psychological distress such as the General Health Questionnaire?   RESULTS   The univariate correlations need to be expressed more clearly. For example instead of stating that "The   significant   negative   correlations   were observed   between   social   support   and psychological   outcomes", the authors could have written something like -   " Low levels of social support were significantly associated with higher levels of anxiety and depression."   DISCUSSION   Again it will be easier for the reader to comprehend the findings of the study if the authors elaborate on them a bit more. For example, the discussion starts with sentence that – "Our results showed that among personality traits, neuroticism and extraversion exert the strongest effects (indirect & direct) on psychological outcomes, that is to say neuroti