



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 101312

Title: Depression and anxiety disorders in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease patients: Prevalence, disease impact, treatment

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07218425

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: Doctor, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2024-09-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Editor

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-09-10 16:20

Reviewer performed review: 2024-09-16 10:54

Review time: 5 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) The manuscript addresses an important topic by exploring the prevalence and impact of depression and anxiety in COPD patients. The comprehensive review of current literature is commendable. However, the structure and clarity of the content could be improved to enhance readability and coherence. 2)The abstract provides a good overview but could benefit from a more concise summary of the main findings and implications. Consider reducing the length while ensuring all key points are covered. 3)The introduction is well-detailed, providing a solid background on COPD and its comorbidities. However, it may be beneficial to streamline some sections to maintain reader engagement. For instance, some epidemiological details could be summarized more concisely. 4) Line 14: "The etiology of COPD remains not fully understood..." - Consider rephrasing to "The etiology of COPD is not fully understood..." Line 25: "Patients with COPD exhibit a range of symptoms including chronic cough..." - Consider summarizing the symptoms briefly and focusing more on the relevance to the study's objectives. 5)The references are comprehensive and relevant. 6)Some sections contain long and complex sentences, which may hinder readability. Consider breaking these into



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

shorter, more concise sentences. Additionally, ensure that technical terms are adequately explained for a broad audience. 7) Shorten and focus on key findings and implications in abstract . The results are comprehensive, but the presentation could be more structured. Consider using subheadings to clearly delineate different aspects of the findings (e.g., prevalence, impact on disease progression, treatment strategies). This would improve readability and make it easier for readers to follow the discussion. mostly " 2.2 Impact on Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQL)" this section is important. Can make it more valuable and add updated information 8)The conclusions are appropriate but could be more specific regarding the recommendations for clinical practice and future research. Emphasize the need for integrated care approaches and highlight any gaps in the current research that need to be addressed. 9)The discussion provides valuable insights but could be more focused. Ensure that each paragraph has a clear main point and that there is a logical flow between paragraphs. Avoid redundancy and ensure that the implications of the findings are clearly stated.