

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_101062
Title of the Manuscript:	Psychometric Properties of the COVID Stress Scales among a Cross-section of Africans with Chronic, Stable Medical Conditions.
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 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1) Yes. 2) Yes. 3) Yes. 4) Yes. 5) Yes. 6) Yes.</p> <p>I was confused by this sentence: "The original validation had a 5-factor structure, namely; 1) fear of danger and contamination, 2) fear about economic consequences, 3) xenophobia, 4) compulsive checking and reassurance seeking, and 5) traumatic stress symptoms."</p> <p>To what validation are the authors talking about? The one made in US/Canadian contexts? Or was there a study in Nigeria validating this scale before this research was made?</p> <p>“</p> <p>Also: it is necessary to specify whether an EFA or a CFA was made (I believe the authors used EFA).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Since the factors strongly correlate to each other in the scale, the authors could try an oblique rotation, instead of varimax.</p> <p>I'm assuming the authors performed Exploratory Factor Analysis. It is OK for this first publication. However, I suggest authors perform Confirmatory Factor Analysis after that, and publish it in another study.</p> <p>Varimax rotation is interesting when each subscale needs to be more independent by itself (like some Big-Five personality scales). However, I'm not sure whether that is the case here. Maybe a general score fits better, even for practical uses. In this case, the authors could try oblique rotations and analysis. For example, oblimin and promax rotations. I suggest these references:</p> <p>Abdi, H. (2003). Factor Rotations in Factor Analyses. <i>Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods</i>, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412950589</p> <p>Akhtar-Danesh, N. (2017). A Comparison between Major Factor Extraction and Factor Rotation Techniques in Q-Methodology. <i>Open Journal of Applied Sciences</i>, 07(04), 147–156. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojapps.2017.74013</p> <p>Darton, R. A. (2006). Rotation in Factor Analysis. <i>The Statistician</i>, 29(3), 167. https://doi.org/10.2307/2988040</p> <p>Finch, W. H. (2017). A Comparison of Factor Rotation Methods for Dichotomous Data. <i>Journal of Modern Applied Statistical Methods</i>, 10(2), 549–570. https://doi.org/10.22237/jmasm/1320120780</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Rahn, M. (2019). The Factor Analysis. Retrieved March 1, 2019, from https://www.theanalysisfactor.com/factor-analysis-how-many-factors/</p> <p>CFA will be useful to have a smaller scale, since in the context of a hospital, shorter instruments are better (not everyone has the time to collect data).</p> <p>The authors should make more studies with this instrument.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Pedro Augusto Croce Carlotto
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil