



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 96712

**Title:** Network analysis of adolescent non-suicidal self-injury subgroups identified through latent profile analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 08075515

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** China

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-05-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Lin Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-09-05 07:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-09-06 05:11

**Review time:** 21 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<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 novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<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 creativity or innovation



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

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think this manuscript is innovative to a certain extent, and can be seen from the author's work in this spiritual field. The study elucidates distinct network characteristics of NSSI subgroups, studying both subgroups highlight the importance of emotional control and family support as potential focal points for targeted interventions. The research has a good innovation, but there are still a small part of the content needs to be modified. In addition, the method used in this study is a cross-sectional study, which may be a relatively limited result, and the persuasion of this study should be further verified through cohort studies or longitudinal studies. I will keep a close eye on the progress of this paper and thank the author for his great contribution. 1. It is recommended to reduce the number of keywords to five. 2. In introduction, the content is obtrusive: Over 80% of individuals..... It is suggested that this paragraph be integrated with the previous paragraph. 3. If possible, can you update the references with the latest research. 4. Can you provide complete network analysis code for verification. 5. Notice some inconsistencies in formatting, such as line spacing. 6. In the discussion, the content is not in-depth enough to have a good further discussion on the



**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

results of this study. I hope to deepen the content of the discussion part. 7. There is a question that the author needs to explain to me. In the last paragraph of 4.5 in the discussion, does the revised discussion mean that there has been a round of revisions? If so, since I have not seen the initial version, could you briefly explain to me the difference between the initial version and the revised version. Thank you again for your contribution to this study and hope to reply as soon as possible. To sum up, I think the author needs to respond to the above requirements and make minor modifications. Best wishes