

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



December 30, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: SNS-Revised, NO 14328).

Title: Sensation/novelty seeking in psychotic disorders: a review of the literature

Author: Vaios Peritogiannis

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 14328

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewers

Reviewer 1

Author reviewed the personality traits is important for the better understanding of the person suffering from psychosis and for treatment individualization. The aim of this review was to summarize the literature on sensation/novelty seeking in the patients with schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders. The author presented an interesting review on the mentioned topic. The review is well written and provides an educational background to this situations and effect on treatment. However, this study is not a meta-analysis. Comparative statistical methods were not used. This is a review or mini-review. Article should be regulated according to the writing principles of journal. Therefore, the results section should be removed. These deficiencies should be corrected. In my view, this corrected paper provide new and convincing data and it is suitable for publication.

According to the reviewer's suggestion the manuscript has been edited according to the Journal guidelines. The Results section has been removed and replaced by "Search references" section. Inappropriate citations, that is more than 5 references in a citation have been changed. The reader is now referred to the tables (in brackets).

Reviewer 2

The authors review the literature on sensation/novelty seeking in psychotic disorders. Introduction/Discussion: 1. Authors mention in introduction that the two traits (sensation and novelty seeking) are identical. They could add the exact correlations between the scales to discussion, they could discuss that also related concepts exist in other scales (openness to experiences).

According to the reviewer's proposal I have added the correlation between SS and NS and I have referred to the related concept named Openness to experiences in the

Introduction (ref 15) but also in the Discussion section (ref 67)

2. Authors could add references to the scales (SSS, TCI, TPQ) listed in the introduction

The relative references were added to the scales

Materials and Methods:

3. It seems that some of the studies on the topic have been missed by the authors, they should check e.g. Cortés MJ et al. (Eur Psychiatry 2009;24:476–82) and Guillem et al. (Schizophr Res 2002;56:137-47.). 4. Margetic et al., Kurs et al., Poustka et al., and Boeker et al. are included but not in Table 7, but I think they include case-control comparisons.

All these studies were included in the original manuscript, in table 1 (Cortes et al, Guillem et al). The other 4 studies were included in different tables according to their objective

5. There are also non-English articles on the topic (Aschauer HN et al. Neuropsychiatr 1994;8:177-81; Gulec H. Noropsikiyatri Ars 2009;46:8-12), not necessary to include here but can be useful. If not included, the restriction to English language should be mentioned in the limitations. 6. The search was limited only to one database, this is a limitation, some of the research from this topic can be found e.g. only from PsycINFO or from general databases, such as Scopus.

According to the reviewer's comment I have referred to these limitations in the revised manuscript

7. The search could have used also the original scales names, as if the focus on the study was not on novelty/sensation seeking or if nothing significant was found from the novelty/sensation seeking the search might have missed those studies.

An additional search was performed, as proposed by the reviewer, which provided an additional paper (53. Farhady Y, Fadai F, Mazinani R, Ashtari Z, Alawijeh M. Sensation seeking behavior among schizophrenics. Neurosciences (Riyadh). 2007; 12: 62-64), now included in the manuscript

8. Inclusion/exclusion criteria should be presented in more detail: Diagnostic criteria (any psychosis?), Included scales, and especially which outcomes were accepted.

This point has been addressed in the “Search references” section and more details on the selection criteria have been provided, according to the reviewer's suggestion

Results:

9. The diagnoses of the studies could be in the table.

All diagnoses are now presented in the tables, as the reviewer suggested

Discussion:

10. Authors discuss that possible psychotic patients have higher SNS levels than controls. The point that abusing patients are often excluded is a good one and the recommendation that they should not be excluded is a good one. They do have as a group higher SNS levels than non-abusing patients, but variation is large, the explanation in parentheses that those with high SNS are “abusing patients” could be modified e.g. “more likely to be abusing patients”.

I have made this modification according to the reviewer’s proposal

Due to these changes a number of references have been added and the numbers of previous references have been changed accordingly.

All changes are highlighted in the revised text with color type

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing my manuscript in the *World Journal of Psychiatry*.

Sincerely yours

30/12/2014

 **Vaios Peritogiannis**
Vaivos Peritogiannis
MD, MSc, PhD

Vaios Peritogiannis MD, MSc, PhD
Private Practice Psychiatrist
Address: 1 Moulaimidou str, Ioannina, Greece, 45444
Phone/fax number: +302651021227
E-mail address: vaivos.peritogiannis@medai.gr