

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_71079
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors Associated with the Mental Health of Health Care Workers Exposed to Pandemic-Covid-19
Type of the 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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>This is a well-written research paper on a very timely problem. The authors have done an excellent job. I just have a few comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it possible to include the original survey questionnaire in the article, so that the readers can decide whether the questions included were adequate or succinct enough to capture the information they intended. 2. Can you break down the response rate into the demographic variables. For eg, what are the response rates for different age groups/gender groups/health care work types (eg, nurses, doctors, paramedics, etc)? This Q may not be possible to answer if the authors didn't track who the survey questionnaires were sent out to. But as least give an estimate. 3. Q2 above is important because the answers may reveal some systematic biases among the respondents. For eg, doctors who are more susceptible to mental health issues tend to be more responsive to the survey. And they turn out to be suffering from higher levels of actual mental stress. Therefore you get an overall mental health rating that is biased to the poor side. This kind of bias is known as "self-selectivity bias". The most famous eg is a wealth survey in which only the billionaires responded and the researchers extrapolated to the whole population and concluded everybody in the country is a billionaire ! 4. Your overall response rate is > 90% so the above problem may not be serious. But at least you should raise the possibility and discuss its implications. 5. The dependent variable here is the level of mental health. Presumably it's a kind of ranking from say 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest level of stress. In other words, the authors should use an appropriate categorical variable model such as multinomial logit or probit. Ordinary least squares is not suitable. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eric Li
Department, University & Country	University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong