Comprehensive Health and Biomedical Studies
Volume 2 · Issue 2 · e143272

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Investigating the Prevalence of Post-traumatic Stress Disorder in Patients Who Have Recovered From COVID-19

Mona Ebrahimzadeh, Raha Tabahfar, Hakimeh Eskandari Sabzi, Mahsa Tafazoli

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
5 Dec 2023	11 Aug 2024	18 Aug 2024	10.5812/chbs-143272

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 Associate Editor 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

1 comment · 13 Jan 2024

Associate Editor

REJECT 13 Jan 2024

Dear author
Unfortunately, your manuscript has many flaws, and its title is not innovative. Therefore, your manuscript will be rejected.
Best Regards

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.

Dear Reviewer

Greetings and Regards

While thanking you for reviewing the current study, we felt it necessary to share some points:

-The present study was conducted during the Covid pandemic, and due to some reasons, we were not able to submit the article in the same time frame. When we wrote the project, it was considered one of the current topics. Therefore, the existence of similar studies is not the repetition of the work, but the importance of the topic of psychology.

-In the evaluation, you said that the implementation of the project was fundamentally wrong. Our project has completed all the stages of the proposal evaluation. It has adopted the code of ethics, and there was no problem with the working method in any of these stages. It should be noted that The working method in similar studies has been the same as mentioned in the sources

-Due to the selection of history of mental illnesses as a variable, non-use of antidepressants and anti-anxiety drugs were selected as inclusion criteria

_In the previous version, we had 3 tables. In this version, we merged two tables. Therefore, in this version, the number of tables has been reduced to two tables.

-The results of the article have been reviewed according to the research.

_Ethical considerations, recommendations, recommendations, acknowledgments, contradictions are mentioned in the article submission.

_In the previous version, we had 3 tables. In this version, we merged two tables. Therefore, in this version, the number of tables has been reduced to two tables.

_The results of the article have been reviewed according to the research.

_Ethical considerations, recommendations, recommendations, acknowledgments, contradictions are mentioned in the article submission.

_Ethical considerations, recommendations, recommendations, acknowledgments, contradictions are mentioned in the article submission.

Reviewer 1:
• Abstract
• 6) Are Keywords (3-10) selected from MESH? Keywords need correction

Reply: It was corrected

• Introduction
• 7) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) no

Reply: It was corrected
• Materials and Methods

• 9) Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)?

Reply: It was corrected
• 10) Study Design Described Sufficiently?

Reply: It was corrected
• 11) Adequacy of the sample studied?

Reply: It was corrected
• 12) Subjects Representative of Target Population?

Reply: It was corrected
• 13) Provided sample size calculation or justification?

Reply: It was corrected

9-The data of the study is placed as a file in Pdf format in the submission of the article.

Reviewer 2:
Dear Author, please:
Replace outdated content in the Introduction paragraph with new findings regarding COVID-19.
Revise the introduction for coherence and integration.
Explain the cluster sampling method in detail.
Provide a complete explanation of how data was collected.
Explain why the questionnaire was distributed among the samples 3-6 months after recovering from COVID-19.
Considering the population difference between Isfahan firefighters and the residents of Ahvaz, the mentioned paper may not be an appropriate reference for sample selection.
Psychiatric illness history is a variable that can affect the results. Explain why it was not included as an exclusion criterion and not controlled as a confounding variable.
Remove Table 1 and incorporate essential details into the method section.
Present the items and results of the PTSD questionnaire in a table.
Align the tables of revisions, and main study results.
Add sections for conclusion, limitations, recommendations, acknowledgment, funding, and conflict of interest.
Reformat references using Vancouver style.

Reply: Dear reviewer, while thanking you, we tried to correct the things you said. We explained more in the supplementary file that we left at the end of the response to the reviewers

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.