

party to support the work, such as a government granting agency, charitable foundation or commercial sponsor, check "Yes".

Relevant financial activities outside the submitted work.

This section asks about your financial relationships with entities in the bio-medical arena that could be perceived to influence, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work. You should disclose interactions with ANY entity that could be considered broadly relevant to the work. For example, if your article is about testing an epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) antagonist in lung cancer, you should report all associations with entities pursuing diagnostic or therapeutic strategies in cancer in general, not just in the area of EGFR or lung cancer.

Report all sources of revenue paid (or promised to be paid) directly to you or your institution on your behalf over the 36 months prior to submission of the work. This should include all monies from sources with relevance to the submitted work, not just monies from the entity that sponsored the research. Please note that your interactions with the work's sponsor that are outside the submitted work should also be listed here. If there is any question, it is usually better to disclose a relationship than not to do so.

For grants you have received for work outside the submitted work, you should disclose support ONLY from entities that could be perceived to be affected financially by the published work, such as drug companies, or foundations supported by entities that could be perceived to have a financial stake in the outcome. Public funding sources, such as government agencies, charitable foundations or academic institutions, need not be disclosed. For example, if a government agency sponsored a study in which you have been involved and drugs were provided by a pharmaceutical company, you need only list the pharmaceutical company.

Intellectual Property.

This section asks about patents and copyrights, whether pending, issued, licensed and/or receiving royalties.

Relationships not covered above.

Use this section to report other relationships or activities that readers could perceive to have influenced, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work.

Definitions.

Entity: government agency, foundation, commercial sponsor, academic institution, etc.

Grant: A grant from an entity, generally [but not always] paid to your organization

Personal Fees: Monies paid to you for services rendered, generally honoraria, royalties, or fees for consulting , lectures, speakers bureaus, expert testimony, employment, or other affiliations

Non-Financial Support: Examples include drugs/equipment supplied by the entity, travel paid by the entity, writing assistance, administrative support, etc.

Other: Anything not covered under the previous three boxes

Pending: The patent has been filed but not issued

Issued: The patent has been issued by the agency

Licensed: The patent has been licensed to an entity, whether earning royalties or not

Royalties: Funds are coming in to you or your institution due to your patent

[Continue »](#)

Manuscript ID number:

276655

Title of paper:

Anxiety and resilience of healthcare workers during COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia

Reviewer 1

Evaluations (peer review comments for the author)

1. In general, how do you rate the degree to which the paper is easy to follow and its logical flow?

Good

2. Do the title and abstract cover the main aspects of the work?

Yes. the title and abstract of this manuscript cover the main aspects of the work.

3. If relevant are the results novel? Does the study provide an advance in the field?

Yes. This research is innovative to a certain extent

4. Did the study gain ethical approval appropriate to the country in which the research was performed if human or animal subjects, human cell lines or human tissues were involved and is it stated in the manuscript?

Yes

Does the paper raise any ethical concerns?

No

5. If relevant, are the methods clear and replicable?

Yes

6. If relevant, do all the results presented match the methods described?

Yes

7. If relevant, is the statistical analysis appropriate to the research question and study design?

Yes

8. If relevant, is the selection of the controls appropriate for the study design. Have attempts been made to address potential bias through analytic methods, eg., sensitivity analysis

Yes

9. How do you rate how clearly and appropriately the data are presented

Good

10. If relevant, did the authors, make the underlying data available to the readers?

Yes

11. Do the conclusions correlate to the results found?

Yes

12. Are the figures and tables clear and legible?

Yes

Are images clear and free from unnecessary modification?

Yes

13. I have serious concerns about the validity of this manuscript

No

14. Does the paper use appropriate references in the correct style to promote understanding of the content?

Yes

15. Do you think that the manuscript requires its English grammar, punctuation or spelling to be corrected?

Yes

Evaluation

Comments for the authors:

The topic is timely, and the method and result sections are sound. The major strength is that the article's focus is on exploring the relationship between anxiety and resilience of healthcare workers during COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. It should be noted that the studies are well done and the process of the studies is reasonable.

Nevertheless, I have some further minor amendments to suggest:

1. In the literature review, the authors separately reviewed the literature on anxiety and resilience, but the review of the relationship between anxiety and resilience was not thorough and complete:

In particular, the research review on the relationship between state (of) anxiety and resilience was incomplete, so it cannot reflect the necessity, scientificity and advancement of this study.

Plus, it does not make a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of the literature in these issues, and it does not put forward the possible internal mechanism between state anxiety and resilience. Consequently, the inherent logic of the study is not rigorous and the hypotheses are unclear.

In summary (for the above), it is suggested that the author make a comprehensive revision of the introduction part and the discussion part to reflect the scientificity and rigor of this research from the perspective of the internal logic of the literature.

2. In the section of Material and Methods, the authors need to list a separate part to describe the specific information about the subjects.

3. The discussion section also needs some further information added. It is suggested that the authors focus on the relationship and the potential mechanism between anxiety and resilience.

4. Please follow the rules of English scientific writing in the manuscript. There are a few typographical errors and grammatical mistakes.

Reviewer 2

Evaluations (peer review comments for the author)

1. In general, how do you rate the degree to which the paper is easy to follow and its logical flow?

Good

2. Do the title and abstract cover the main aspects of the work?

Yes

3. If relevant are the results novel? Does the study provide an advance in the field?

Yes

4. Did the study gain ethical approval appropriate to the country in which the research was performed if human or animal subjects, human cell lines or human tissues were involved and is it stated in the manuscript?

Yes

Does the paper raise any ethical concerns?

No

5. If relevant, are the methods clear and replicable?

Yes

6. If relevant, do all the results presented match the methods described?

Yes

7. If relevant, is the statistical analysis appropriate to the research question and study design?

Yes

8. If relevant, is the selection of the controls appropriate for the study design. Have attempts been made to address potential bias through analytic methods, eg., sensitivity analysis

Yes

9. How do you rate how clearly and appropriately the data are presented

Good

10. If relevant, did the authors, make the underlying data available to the readers?

Yes

11. Do the conclusions correlate to the results found?

Yes

12. Are the figures and tables clear and legible?

Yes

Are images clear and free from unnecessary modification?

No

13. I have serious concerns about the validity of this manuscript

No

14. Does the paper use appropriate references in the correct style to promote understanding of the content?

Yes

15. Do you think that the manuscript requires its English grammar, punctuation or spelling to be corrected?

Yes

Evaluation

This is a very interesting and demanding topic in this rapidly rising pandemic situation.

A. My comments and suggestions are as follows. Major Comments:

1. Are both scales validated in the participants' language?

2. It is unclear which language is used to conduct the survey or write the questionnaire.

3. Cronbach alpha needs to be added for each scale as well as for each subscale.

4. I would highly recommend adding some references both in the instruments' section regarding previous studies conducted in Indonesia or (in other countries during the COVID-19 period) using similar instruments.

5. "Statistical analysis" should be added in methodology.

6. I would like to add the "Ethics" section in methodology. Which ethical guidelines the authors followed should be added in this section.

7. "Limitations" section needs to be added in the discussion. The study consisted of several limitations that should be stated clearly.

B. Minor comments:

1. Add 'and' before the last one - "The respondents were healthcare workers at the COVID-19 referral hospital in Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia".

2. Which population is referring to? Mention here - "A study conducted in the early phases of the COVID-19 pandemic in China involved 1,210 respondents and showed that more than half of the respondents experienced moderate to severe psychological impact. Besides, one-third of the respondents experienced moderate to severe anxiety".

Reviewer 3

Evaluations (peer review comments for the author)

1. In general, how do you rate the degree to which the paper is easy to follow and its logical flow?

Fair

2. Do the title and abstract cover the main aspects of the work?

Yes

3. If relevant are the results novel? Does the study provide an advance in the field?

Yes

4. Did the study gain ethical approval appropriate to the country in which the research was performed if human or animal subjects, human cell lines or human tissues were involved and is it stated in the manuscript?

Yes

Does the paper raise any ethical concerns?

No

5. If relevant, are the methods clear and replicable?

No. The present study seems to be an internet-based survey. Web-based questionnaire is very useful but vulnerable to data fabrication. Did the author gather any personal information of the respondents? If so, describe it and how did the author keep confidentiality. If not, describe how did the author confirm there were no duplicated or fabricated answers. I recommend that the authors refer a guideline of web-based research such as CHERRIES.

6. If relevant, do all the results presented match the methods described?

Yes

7. If relevant, is the statistical analysis appropriate to the research question and study design?

No. There are a couple of simple issues.

a) Correlation coefficient between each anxiety score and resilience should be presented in the main text not only in the tables. CC is more important than P value.

b) The significant figures in each data should be uniformed.

8. If relevant, is the selection of the controls appropriate for the study design. Have attempts been made to address potential bias through analytic methods, eg., sensitivity analysis

NA

9. How do you rate how clearly and appropriately the data are presented

Fair

10. If relevant, did the authors, make the underlying data available to the readers?

NA

11. Do the conclusions correlate to the results found?

Yes

12. Are the figures and tables clear and legible?

No. Table 2 and table 3 can be combined to one table. Table 4 and table 5 can be omitted if each data are presented in the main text.

Are images clear and free from unnecessary modification?

Yes

13. I have serious concerns about the validity of this manuscript

No

14. Does the paper use appropriate references in the correct style to promote understanding of the content?

No. The link to <https://www.cdrisc.com> seems to be missing. I found the website on <http://www.connordavidson-resiliencescale.com/>.

15. Do you think that the manuscript requires its English grammar, punctuation or spelling to be corrected?

Yes

Evaluation

For the authors:

A. Please address above responses (see responses to questions 5, 7, 12, 14), and,

B. Major comment:

A major limitation of the present study is that it is unclear whether the obtained data represent the influence of COVID-19 pandemic. Are there preceding studies to have evaluated the anxiety level in medical practitioners with STAI in Indonesia before pandemic? If not, it seems difficult to prove that COVID-19 pandemic has actually raised the anxiety level of the respondents, which the author should mention in the discussion section.

Back to [Manuscript Status](#)

ICMJE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE of MEDICAL JOURNAL EDITORS

Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

- 1. Intro
- 2. Your Details
- 3. This Paper
- 4. Financial Interests
- 5. Patent & Copyrights
- 6. Other Relationships**
- 7. Confirm

Step 6 "Relationships not covered above"

Are there other relationships or activities that readers could perceive to have influenced, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work?

- Yes, the following relationships/conditions/circumstances are present (explain below):
- No other relationships/conditions/circumstances that present a potential conflict of interest

At the time of manuscript acceptance, journals will ask authors to confirm and, if necessary, update their disclosure statements. On occasion, journals may ask authors to disclose further information about reported relationships.

Continue >

[Back to Manuscript Status](#)

ICMJE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE of MEDICAL JOURNAL EDITORS

Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

- [1. Intro](#)
- [2. Your Details](#)
- [3. This Paper](#)**
- [4. Financial Interests](#)
- [5. Patent & Copyrights](#)
- [6. Other Relationships](#)
- [7. Confirm](#)

Step 3 "The Work Under Consideration for Publication"

Did you or your institution **at any time** receive payment or services from a third party (government, commercial, private foundation, etc.) for any aspect of the submitted work (including but not limited to grants, data monitoring board, study design, manuscript preparation, statistical analysis, etc.)?

Are there any relevant conflicts of interest?

Yes No

Back to [Manuscript Status](#)

ICMJE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE of MEDICAL JOURNAL EDITORS

Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

- [1. Intro](#)
- [2. Your Details](#)
- [3. This Paper](#)
- [4. Financial Interests](#)**
- [5. Patent & Copyrights](#)
- [6. Other Relationships](#)
- [7. Confirm](#)

Step 4 "Relevant financial activities outside the submitted work"

Place a check in the appropriate boxes in the table to indicate whether you have financial relationships (regardless of amount of compensation) with entities as described in the instructions. Use one line for each entity; add as many lines as you need by clicking the "Add +" box. You should report relationships that were **present during the 36 months prior to publication**.

Are there any relevant conflicts of interest?

Yes No

Back to [Manuscript Status](#)

ICMJE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE of MEDICAL JOURNAL EDITORS

Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

- 1. Intro
- 2. Your Details
- 3. This Paper
- 4. Financial Interests
- 5. Patent & Copyrights
- 6. Other Relationships
- 7. Confirm

Step 5 "Intellectual Property -- Patents & Copyrights"

Do you have any patents, whether planned, pending or issued, broadly relevant to the work?

Yes No

Continue »