Name of Journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 24227

Manuscript Type: Observational Study

REVISED REPORT

Title: Path analysis among personality traits, stress, social support, and psychological

1- COMMENTS TO AUTHORS- Reviewer's code: 02445219

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.

This article was derived from design of SEPAHAN and its original article has published in the JRMS Journal (reference 28). However, in relation to the demographic characteristics and the sample have been explained and highlighted in parts of method and results

28. **Adibi P**, Keshteli A, Esmaillzadeh A. The study on the epidemiology of psychological, alimentary health and nutrition (SEPAHAN): overview of methodology. *J Res Med Sci* 2012;**17**:S291–7

2. I have never read an abstract before where two sentences began with "so": It was corrected

3. The core tips have no impact at all: It was deleted

4. The tables should have the same form.
Tables were modified

2- COMMENTS TO AUTHORS -Reviewer's code: 02445242

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.
It was corrected.

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.

In this paper, Lazarus coping model (the well-known model) is not target. The focus is on active and avoidant copings. Reason of our chosen for this classification is Coping Strategies Scale. This Scale (derived of Cope questionnaire) has two domains that were discussed. It should be noted that the Scale has validated in Iranian society.

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).

In introduction and discussion, we payed attention to buffering model .Dear

reviewer opinion is not clear for researchers and it is uncertain what changes should to be made, also it is uncertain in which parts researchers have emphasized on main- or direct-effect model.

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. perceived stress was elaborated

Finally, the introduction should ideally end with the stated objectives and a guiding hypothesis for the study: It was corrected.

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?

Stressful Life Events Questionnaire has validated in Iran and it measures both the frequency and 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?

HADS is also used in the general population and there are some examples of it. This paper is part of a large study which was used different variables. In this paper only depression and anxiety were analyzed.

1-Heejeong Kim and Sun-Young Park. Anxiety, Depression and Cognitive Function of Community-Dwelling Elderly in South Korea Indian Journal of Science and

Technology, Vol 8(18),DOI: 10.17485/ijst/2015/v8i18/76244, August 2015

2-Hinz A[1], Finck C, Gómez Y, Daig I, Glaesmer H, Singer S. Anxiety and depression in the general population in Colombia: reference values of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2014 Jan;49(1):41-9. doi: 10.1007/s00127-013-0714-y. Epub 2013 Jun 8

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."

The sentence was amended and It should be noted Pearson correlations was used in the article

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 s

This statement is incomplete and unclear