

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to revise and resubmit our article. You will find our revised manuscript attached. We are grateful for all of the valuable comments. We have thoroughly reviewed all of them and considered each of them very seriously. We present our responses to each of the comments below.

Reviewer #1:

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The research has addressed a very important aspect in the context of social disaster caused by the COVID-19. The relevant dimensions of mental health (State of anger & psychological distress) has been studied with most socially appropriate variables. The findings may be relevant at global scale to provide appropriate governance in such crisis of pandemic in mitigating the COVID -19 induced fragile mental health at community level .

The findings could be beneficial for those who are in mental health counselling. Please kindly consider the observation and recommendations.

This observation was added to the Implications subsection of the Discussion.

Reviewer #2:

**Specific Comments to Authors:** I thank the authors for their work. My comments are the following:

1. Overall, the manuscript needs shortening and structuring to ensure a concise and purposeful presentation.

The manuscript was shortened approximately 15% to ensure a concise and purposeful presentation.

2. Please note that the introduction section needs to be an introduction and not a methodology.

We now present the literature review as a subsection within the Introduction section. As suggested, the literature review was shortened dramatically. As suggested in the APA guidelines for manuscripts, at the end of the literature review, research questions and hypotheses are presented.

3. In the methods section, the description of the variable requires unifying information, and where possible please include tables to provide at a glance orientation of the variables.

As suggested by the reviewer, we now present information for the different variables in a more uniform manner. For each variable, we present the following information in the same order: name of variable, names of the authors who created the scale, number of items, range of answers, names of subscales, example of items, and Cronbach's alpha reliability. We believe that it is most appropriate to present this information as free text, as opposed to in a table. If the reviewer requires that this information be presented as a table, we will do that.

4. Table 1 would ideally represent the sociodemographic profile of the study population.

In the current version of the manuscript, we have changed the format used to report sociodemographic variables. As suggested by the reviewer, the sociodemographic data are now presented in a table (see Table 1).

5. Table 3 needs reformatting. Not all data from statistical software are to be presented in the manuscript.

The original Table 3, like all of the other tables, was designed according to the APA's guidelines for tables. In response to the reviewer's suggestion, we deleted two columns from each dependent variable. The columns that were deleted presented B and SE values. In the current version of the table, we report  $R^2$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $t$ .

6. Strengths, limitations, and implications can be included under respective subheadings.

In the revised manuscript, the strengths, limitations, and implications of this work are presented in separate subsections within the Discussion section.

All of the changes that were made to the paper are noted in Track Changes or highlighted in yellow, to make them easy to follow. The manuscript also underwent an additional round of language editing by a professional editor who is a native speaker of English.

We made many changes to the article in response to the valuable comments we received. We trust that these changes will satisfy the important concerns raised and hope that this revised paper will be acceptable. We look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

The authors

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

**(1) *Science editor:*** 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the factors explain anger and mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. The topic is within the scope of the WJP. (1) Classification: Grade B and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The research has addressed a very important aspect in the context of social disaster caused by the COVID-19. The relevant dimensions of mental health have been studied with most socially appropriate variables. The findings may be relevant at global scale to provide appropriate governance in such crisis of pandemic in mitigating the COVID -19 induced fragile mental health at community level. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are 3 tables; (4) References: A total of 48 references are cited, including 31 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are 2 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to [editorialoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:editorialoffice@wjgnet.com). The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Institutional Review Board Approval Form and the written informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The study was supported by BGU COVID-19 CORONA CHALLENGE. The topic has not previously been published in the WJP. 5 Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); (2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (3) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text. 6 Re-Review: Not required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

**(2) *Company editor-in-chief:*** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Psychiatry, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted.

I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

We have uploaded funding agency copy of any approval document.

The "Article Highlights" section was added at the end of the main text.

As we understand, no extra revisions were asked by the editor. Thus, all comments from the reviewers were addressed as noted above.