

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_92369
Title of the Manuscript:	A Cross-Sectional Study of Depressive Symptoms among Women with Gynecological Cancer Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Title: perhaps worth rephrase to avoid misleading – include Retrospective cross-sectional study. Also, the aim is to compare – yet this not reflected in the title. What other cancers? – depression and anxiety is associated cancer but this association is not only explained by the psychosocial stress reaction with receiving a diagnosis but also biological due to inflammatory changes of the cancer disease itself, inflammatory cytokines which overlaps with clinical depressive response neurochemically. Furthermore, cytotoxic effects of treatment has also found to induce neurochemical changes, i.e. BBB permeability. What informs the assumption that gynaecological cancer may be at risk of depression more than other forms of cancer (which cancers). Provide a scientific justification even in the background of the ABSTRACT to justify why a comparative study is indicated. Why a focus before and after COVID- provide a scientific rationale as to this decision- make the hypothesis clear. Why the inclusion of other health variables? Justification and rationale not provided that could strengthen the science of this study. Is there an assumption that patients dx gynaecological cancer diagnosed with covid is worse off ? if so- make this clear.. However, I would suggest that the authors streamline carefully what the actual RESEARCH QUESTION is that they try to answer? This is not clear Pg.2 end of 1st paragraph – sentence is inserted on depression and covid – and that is the only mention Sample study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clearly articulated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ STAGE OF CANCER ? ○ DURATION SINCE RECEIVING DIAGNOSIS? ○ HOW LONG AFTER DIAGNOSIS WAS THE DEPRESSION EVALIATED? • Cancer treatment ? Duration? -when was depression evaluated? <p>Study sample Again this section is not clearly described “women who had cancer but did not respond positively to having GC were also identified” – what is meant by this Sampling procedure not described Ethics – use of secondary data – how was this process followed In the current format this manuscript is confusing. Impression a lot of variables are thrown together with no clear scientific rationale for the inclusion – hence the absence of a clear scientific Research Question with clearly aligned objectives- which is missing. Methodologically and scientifically need to be enhance before considered for publication.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Antonio G Lentoer
Department, University & Country	School of Medicine, Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University, South Africa