

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 27214

Title: Oral but not written test anxiety is related to social anxiety

Reviewer's code: 02445209

Reviewer's country: Czech Repoublic

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-05-19 11:26

Date reviewed: 2016-05-31 02:11

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 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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input 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

Dear authors, I do not have any substantial criticism related to your article. Perhaps, the abbreviation "PAF" is used but not explained in the section "Procedure and Participants". I appreciate the comprehensive research methodology in your article. The reviewer

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 27214

Title: Oral but not written test anxiety is related to social anxiety

Reviewer's code: 02445294

Reviewer's country: Norway

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-05-19 11:26

Date reviewed: 2016-06-13 21:16

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

Nice little study with a defined focus. Please clearly describe which scales or subscales have been applied twice - once related to oral and once to written exams. What was the rationale for reporting Spearman's and Pearson's correlation coefficients? Please omit those that are not convenient. Please report correlation coefficients with two decimals (1st paragraph of results). I would like to read the exact p values for each of your test scores and not the inconsistent presentation of $p < .05$ or $p > .05$ versus $p = .007$. What was the rationale for not using multivariate statistics (e.g., ANOVA models)?