Journal of Skin and Stem Cell
Volume 10 · Issue 2 · e137387

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Charismaphobia: Diagnosis and Measurement of the Psychodermatological Symptoms

Waqar Husain

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
6 May 2023	21 May 2023	26 May 2023	10.5812/jssc-137387

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 2, Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3

Authors' reply to reviewers 4

Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

3 comments · 15 May 2023 – 17 May 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 15 May 2023

The study presents the concept of charismaphobia, including its pathological and diagnostic features. The investigation involved 2,904 participants and was conducted in four phases. The study also details the development and validation of a 19-item self-report scale in English, which was accomplished through principal, exploratory, and confirmatory factor analyses.
1. The article's introduction and background lack a clear and comprehensive explanation. Although the authors use the first-person pronoun "I," they should also provide additional references and a more thorough rationale for conducting the study to help readers better understand the context and purpose of the research.
2. Further information is needed regarding the selection of participants in the four phases of the study. The study should elaborate on how, when, and where the participants were selected, as well as the inclusion and exclusion criteria used to determine their eligibility for the study. Clarifying these details would help readers better understand the study's methodology.
3. The settings and timeframe of the study in each phase should be explained in more detail.
4. The article's discussion section is insufficient and requires further development. Additional work is necessary to strengthen the discussion and ensure that it provides a comprehensive analysis of the study's findings and their implications.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 17 May 2023

Dear EIC,
The manuscript can be published after some revision:
The abstract should be revised:
- The study design should be added to the first line of the methods section in the abstract.
- A summary of the statistical analysis should be added to the results section of the abstract.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 17 May 2023

Dear Author,
Your manuscript needs revision. Please revise it based on the comments.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response to Reviewer1: Modifications in this regard are in Blue in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 1:
In this study, authors constructed a new phenomenon 'charismaphobia' and elaborated on its pathological and diagnostic aspects. They incorporated qualitative and quantitative methods and involved 15 participants in 4 phases. A self-respondent scale of 19 items in English was developed and 16 validated through principal, exploratory, and confirmatory factor analyses. Finally, they make a conclusion that Charismaphobia i.e. the fear of unattractiveness was presented as a new construct in the current study, along with its clinical picture and diagnostic solutions. This study is interesting. However, there are some concerns should be addressed before publication.

1. Ethical Approval should be mentioned in the manuscript.
It has been added under the heading Procedure.

2. How did you carry out this study without any funding?
As mentioned under the heading Procedure, students were involved to collect data voluntarily. The study was not funded from any source.

Response to Reviewer2: Modifications in this regard are in Green in the revised manuscript.

The study presents the concept of charismaphobia, including its pathological and diagnostic features. The investigation involved 2,904 participants and was conducted in four phases. The study also details the development and validation of a 19-item self-report scale in English, which was accomplished through principal, exploratory, and confirmatory factor analyses.
1. The article's introduction and background lack a clear and comprehensive explanation. Although the authors use the first-person pronoun "I," they should also provide additional references and a more thorough rationale for conducting the study to help readers better understand the context and purpose of the research.

Please note that the word limit authorized by the journal is 3500 words for research related articles. I had to be within that limit. However, based on the recommendations, I have restructured the paper, have added some new sentences and the introduction about charsimaphobia in the Introduction part instead of putting it in Method. I have also re-written the Discussion part based on the suggestions.
Referring to "I", please note that I have provided a reference of my earlier paper which is the background of this study i.e. "The current study was initiated after my frequent clinical observations of women with anxiety, related to getting unattractive (2)". Secondly, my introduction would surely be added along with the paper upon its publication.

2. Further information is needed regarding the selection of participants in the four phases of the study. The study should elaborate on how, when, and where the participants were selected, as well as the inclusion and exclusion criteria used to determine their eligibility for the study. Clarifying these details would help readers better understand the study's methodology.

The following sentences have been added now based on the recommendations:

The study involved 2904 participants from Islamabad and Rawalpindi, Pakistan.
All the participants were included in the studies conveniently with only one condition that they could respond to the questionnaire in English. The educational qualifications of the participants ranged from college level education to doctorate. The average educational qualification of the participants was graduation from university. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 75 years with an average age of 28 years.

3. The settings and timeframe of the study in each phase should be explained in more details.
A new sentence has been added: *Data was collected from January 2021 till September 2022.*

4. The article's discussion section is insufficient and requires further development. Additional work is necessary to strengthen the discussion and ensure that it provides a comprehensive analysis of the study's findings and their implications.

The Discussion has been re-written and the suggestions have been fully incorporated.

Response to Associate Editor
- a summary of statistical analaysis should be add to result section of abstract.
Abstract has been modified and the suggested changes have been brought.

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 21 May 2023 – 26 May 2023

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 21 May 2023

In this revision, the authors answered my questions well. No more comments. Accept for publication.

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 26 May 2023

Dear authors,
Thank you very much for the revisions.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 26 May 2023

Dear EIC,
The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. The subject of the manuscript is very important in the diagnosis & measurement of psychodermatological symptoms.
The authors have addressed all the comments. Now, it is acceptable.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 26 May 2023

Dear Author,
Thank you for correcting the pitfalls and answering my questions.