

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_89235
Title of the Manuscript:	Influencing aspect of media in the development of Novel Coronavirus symptoms without the disease: Nocebo Phenomenon
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Please revise the manuscript's English grammar</p> <p><b>Abstract</b> Please choose: Media information or the media itself? Suggestion: to observe the impact of media information on the development of ..... Concluion: Suggestion: this study showed that there were more than just nocebo developing symptoms</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> Please shorten the introduction.</p> <p><b>Rationality of the study</b> Please look at these publication <a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8541064/">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8541064/</a> <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34041973/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34041973/</a> <a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7661580/">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7661580/</a> Please state the novelty of this study compared to previous publisher journals. What are the differences from the previous study?</p> <p><b>Procedure</b> 1. Please describe how many interviewers for this study? Was there any calibration before interviewing subjects? How did the calibration take place, etc? 2. What approach did the study use? Inductive – deductive (or vice versa), because the author stated that this study used qualitative exploratory design? Please describe the steps for these approaches used for this study 3. How may investigators do the analytical codes or interpretation for the qualitative codes?</p> <p><b>Ethical</b> Please state the registration of ethical clearance from what committee for this study.</p> <p><b>Table 1</b> Please state what kind of symptoms did subjects complain These subjects may have different aspects in the result because most of the population showed age between 20-28 yo and unmarried.</p> <p><b>Result</b> Please describe how many passages were identified in how many categories? How the author already did conclude the thematic in the study (anxiety, fear, media influence, trace of nocebo)? Please state why the author already used these probing questions in the method? Did it correlate to COVID-19 symptoms or correlate to anxiety or fear or etc?</p> <p><b>Limitation</b> Please also state the strength of this study.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title</b> Suggestion: Impact of media information in the development of COVID-19 symptoms without the disease: Nocebo Phenomenon</p> <p><b>Method participant</b> Suggestion: rapid antigen test should not become the standard golden test for this qualitative study. Some of the subjects may have positive SARS-CoV-2 infection.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Based on one of many publications about rapid antigen test for COVID-19 (<a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34242764/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34242764/</a>) The overall sensitivity of the rapid antigen test was 65.3% (95% confidence interval [CI] 56.8-73.1), the specificity was 99.9% (95% CI 99.5-100.0). In asymptomatic individuals, the sensitivity was 44.0% (95% CI 24.4-65.1).</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> Suggestion: to increase the quality of this study, please refer to the assessment of the quality study. You may use any assessment tool; I suggest the following tool. <a href="https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2021-10/Checklist_for_Qualitative_Research.docx">https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2021-10/Checklist_for_Qualitative_Research.docx</a></p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Indrayadi Gunardi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Trisakti, Indonesia</b>