

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jxym-23-22>

Reviewer A

The authors examined the correlation between anxiety and allergic rhinitis. Although the data in this manuscript are interesting and worth, more detailed analysis of the results are needed before publication in this journal.

Major comments:

1. You should divide the results into male and female and present the results in Table 2.

Table 2 has been divided based on gender.

2. There is possibility that the different types of allergens (e.g. pollen and house dust) may determine whether the patient falls into anxiety or not. Therefore, you should be considered the results for each type of allergens.

The pollen allergens were not investigated in the present study.

3. If possible, you should increase the number of male participants.

In this research environment, female participants had a higher dominance, so we encountered quite a few difficulties in adding male participants.

Reviewer B

The concept is original and inspiring and provides information with considerable level of novelty in the field of allergic rhinitis. There are, however, multiple issues that I feel obliged to address as a reviewer of the manuscript. Please find them below.

TITLE

1. I would suggest considering its change to: „Correlation between anxiety scores and intensity of allergic rhinitis symptoms” which reflect the contents in a more informative way

The title of our study has been modified to "Correlation between Anxiety Scores and Recurrence of Allergic Rhinitis" to accurately reflect our research objective of investigating the association between anxiety and the chance of allergic rhinitis recurrence, as opposed to the association between anxiety and symptom severity.

ABSTRACT

2. Line 20: suggested modification: „...allergic rhinitis symptoms’ intensity”

The paragraph has been rephrased.

3. Conclusion: the whole sentence does not read well and is not informative, this should be rewritten

The abstract of our article has been updated.

MANUSCRIPT TEXT

4. Line 49: please add: „ca. 400 million people worldwide.

The sentence has been updated. (page 5, line 61)

5. Line 58: „...of the time” – this seems to be a mistake, please rephrase or explain.

The sentence has been updated. (page 5, line 68)

6. Line 64: The phrase „mental illness” is rather an overstatement here, not quite appropriate. I would rather here to lowering the quality of life and everyday disturbances, is this what the Authors had in mind? This may result in greater susceptibility to some of mental disorders, mainly depressive episodes. This should be clarified.

The paragraph has been rephrased. (Page 6, line 72-74)

7. Line 68: research by Patten et al. INSTEAD OF Patten et al.’s research

The sentence has been updated. (Page 6, line 78)

8. Line 74-76: please state your goal in a more precise way, this does not read well.

The sentence has been updated. (Page 6, line 81-82)

9. Line 80-81: statement not clear due to errors in English language.

The sentence has been updated.

Methods section

10. Please provide information about possible requirements for the Ethical committee agreement. Is this required in your country for this type of study? If not, please state it clearly.

The study was approved by the Health Research Ethics Committee of Faculty of Medicine and Health Science, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (Approval No. 115/EC-KEPK FKIK UMY/II/2023) on February 7, 2023. The declaration of ethics applies until February 7, 2024.

11. Since SFAR questionnaire is not widely used outside Indonesia (as I suppose), is it possible to provide its English translation (although not validated) as an appendix, together with point score attributed to each question. Additionally, please place the reference for the publication of SFAR questionnaire design and validation in Indonesian.

The SFAR questionnaire has been included as an appendix.

12. Please provide the list of allergens for which the patients had been tested with regard to presence of IgE sensitization. Standard inhalant allergen panels are not uniform throughout the world and are highly dependent on the climate, flora and fauna. Therefore, this would be interesting for readers from different geographical areas.

The research did not include an analysis of the various kinds of allergens.

Results section

13. Table 1: please use rather the term “number” instead of “frequency”.

(Page 7, line 109)

14. Table 2: description of columns is incomplete, probably it’s the same as in table 1,

but it is not self-explanatory

(Page 8, line 110)

15. Lines 124 through 127: this paragraph has some flaws in English and should be rephrased.

The faults in the paragraph have been corrected.

Discussion section

16. In the first lines of discussion (131 and 132) the Authors say that the study examined the relationship between anxiety levels and AR recurrence, whereas previously they stated that this goal was to analyze the correlation between anxiety and AR symptoms intensity. This is a considerable discrepancy and should be amended and clarified. Moreover, the term „recurrence” keeps reappearing throughout the text which provides further confusion.

We regret any misunderstanding that may have arisen. The primary objective of our research is to investigate the correlation between anxiety levels and the recurrence of allergic rhinitis (AR). Consequently, the term "recurrence" is frequently utilized throughout our text.

17. Lines 170-174: this is a very long sentence that does not read well and should be rewritten. More importantly, the information provided is not quite understandable and clear: how the correlation between SFAR score value and the „recurrence” of allergic rhinitis can detect a primary cause of AR? This is not logical in my opinion. If this is due to language flaw, please amend. Otherwise, the information provided is not relevant.

The paragraph has been revised, and we anticipate the statement to be more suitable.

18. Lines 174 through 176 need rephrasing, information provided is inconsistent – who is exactly providing treatment: doctors or patients themselves? Please clarify or correct.

The paragraph has been revised, and we anticipate the statement to be more relevant.

19. Line 179: again, referring to SFAR, the Authors say that its specificity and sensitivity is high. However, providing references for the SFAR validation (not further use!) is important here. What are the values of specificity and sensitivity of the SFAR?

The validity testing of the questionnaire conducted by Annesi-Maesano et al. in 2002 yielded a sensitivity of 74%, specificity of 83%, positive predictive value (PPV) of 84%, and negative predictive value (NPV) of 74%. As a result, the questionnaire is no longer undergoing validity testing. Furthermore, Naiboho's (2017) study yielded significant findings, including a sensitivity rate of 80% and a specificity rate of 83.3%. These data have been incorporated into our manuscript.

20. Line 183: the authors mention correctly that psychiatric disorders concomitant with AR are often treated with proper psychotropic drugs. IN later paragraphs of the discussion, they stated that psychiatric medication was not checked for ion their study. In view of this fact, I suggest removing the mention about psychotropics, since it is not relevant here.

The paragraph has been removed.

References

21. please consider referring to current ARIA guidelines for management of allergic rhinitis, e.g. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2020 Jan;145(1):70-80.e3. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2019.06.049. Epub 2019 Oct 15.

22. Also, please uniformize the references - check for the Journal guidelines and use one format for all references.

The references in this article have been updated according to the Vancouver style, and the Mendeley reference manager software has been utilized.

In summary, the concept of the research is original and innovative and the topic can be of interest for both allergists and psychiatrists as well as for psychologists and general practitioners. However, the presentation of results, the manuscript itself and the language have multiple flaws. The manuscript should be thoroughly and considerably modified before this can be considered at further stages of the publication process.