

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	The prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder and associated factors among Koshe landslide survivors, Addis Ababa Ethiopia: A community-based, cross-sectional study
AUTHORS	Asnakew, Sintayehu; shumet, shegaye; Ginbare, Worknesh; Legas, Getasew; Haile, Kalkidan

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Fernando Navarro-Mateu, MD, PhD Unidad de Docencia, Investigación y Formación en Salud Mental (UDIF-SM). Servicio Murciano de Salud. IMIB-Arixaca. CIBER-Esp. Murcia Spain
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Jan-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Authors present the prevalence and associated factors of PTSD of a cross-sectional study after a garbage landslide in Ethiopia. Though this is a weird disaster, authors do not comment the specific characteristics of this kind of catastrophes compared to others that would increase the interest of potential readers. Several other aspects of the study in relation of the review checklist are:</p> <p>2. Abstract: it is structured, but data on the representativeness of the participants, the recruitment methods and the statistical analyses used have not been included.</p> <p>3. Study design: the representativeness of the sample is one of the key methodological questions in a cross-sectional design and this aspect is not well described. It should be stated if a sample size was calculated, the method used to select only one individual per household, how the authors calculated the response rate (98.2%). Authors focused on p-value and they not mention the Odds ratio. Important items, such as history of mental illness, family history of mental illness, experiencing childhood trauma, among others, are not described.</p> <p>4. Reproducibility of the study: see above.</p> <p>6. Statistics: see above.</p> <p>7. References: • No specific information about psychiatric consequences of landslide is presented. Some of the papers discovered by a quick</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>search in PubMed with the following keywords 'prevalence', 'PTSD' and 'landslide' have not been included, one of the a systematic review (Kennedy et al, PLOS Curr 2015;7).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some concerns about the adequacy of the cited references with examples as the paper of Atwoli et al (reference n^o 15). It is stated that "A recent community-based study in South Africa showed that trauma exposure is higher in lower-income countries compared with high-income countries which resulted in a high rate of PTSD(15)", but that paper is a review, not a community-based study. • References format should be improved, e.g. references numbers 30, 34, and 40 among others. <p>10. Presentation of results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a total confusion on the table order and description. Sociodemographic variables are referred to table 1 in the text, but it corresponds to table 4. No mention is included to table 3 in the text. • Results of the multivariate analyses are described as a mere list of those variables with a p-value less than 0.05 presented in table 4 in the text, but it really corresponds to table 3 and the presentation might be more descriptive, e.g. including the range of odds ratios. • Included figures do not add any value and could be included in the text and figure 1 is difficult to interpret. • The format of the tables should be improved to allow readers to interpret them independently from the text and homogeneity through all of them should be warranted, e.g. number of decimals, foot-notes, ... <p>11. Discussion and conclusions: The specific characteristics of the analyzed catastrophe (a garbage landslide) and the potential impact in PTSD prevalence compared to other human or natural disasters have not been mentioned.</p> <p>12. Limitations: authors only reflect three limitations, but do not mention one of the principal concerns about the representativeness of the participants.</p> <p>13. Supplementary reporting: It would be very important to follow the STROBE statement for reporting observational studies.</p> <p>15. Written English: it should be reviewed by a native English speaker, e.g. the description of Strengths and limitations of the study.</p> <p>Due to the infrequency of the studied disaster, if authors respond to comments and make a major revision of the document, editor might consider it to be suitable for publication.</p>
--	--

REVIEWER	Atsushi Sakuma Department of Psychiatry, Tohoku University Hospital, Japan
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Feb-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	Authors have examined PTSD symptoms among survivors of the 2018 koshe landslide in Ethiopia. PTSD is a frequently observed psychopathology and thus important public health matter after
-------------------------	--

	<p>disasters. Therefore, this study may add further evidence to the field of disaster psychiatry. However, the manuscript has to solve several major concerns to be published in BMJ open.</p> <p>Introduction Although general epidemiology and diagnosis about PTSD are presented, there is little description of why it was necessary to investigate this group of survivors. Therefore, it is difficult to understand the importance of the study. Since most readers are not familiar with Koshe landslide, authors must describe about the disaster more thoroughly, and show the distinctive features of the participants in this study, preferably by comparing with other natural/manmade disasters.</p> <p>Discussion Many of the descriptions lack logical relationship, and thus difficult to follow. If this manuscript is to be revised, the authors may consult a professional to assist with this.</p> <p>Conclusion Authors must indicate how to utilize the result of this study to support victims of the disaster or future disasters.</p> <p>The manuscript requires further English editing.</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

For Reviewer: 1

1. Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Response: now stated in competing interest section of the manuscript

2. Authors present the prevalence and associated factors of PTSD of a cross-sectional study after a garbage landslide in Ethiopia. Though this is a weird disaster, authors do not comment the specific characteristics of this kind of catastrophes compared to others that would increase the interest of potential readers. Several other aspects of the study in relation of the review checklist are:

Response: Now we have included at the end of introduction section and highlighted with red color.

3. Abstract: it is structured, but data on the representativeness of the participants, the recruitment methods and the statistical analyses used have not been included.

Response: now included and highlighted with red color in the abstract section of the manuscript.

4. Study design: the representativeness of the sample is one of the key methodological questions in a cross-sectional design and this aspect is not well described. It should be stated if a sample size was calculated, the method used to select only one individual per household, how the authors calculated the response rate (98.2%). Authors focused on p-value and they not mention the Odds ratio. Important items, such as history of mental illness, family history of mental illness, experiencing childhood trauma, among others, are not described.

Response: yes, we have included sample size determination, how to select participants in the house hold. The response rate was calculated using sample size as base line. We had 830 participants who complete the interview. The rest 15 participants with different reason were not involved in the interview. On odds ratio, now mentioned (page-5). History of mental illness, family history of mental illness, experiencing childhood trauma, is now described (on page- 5)

5. Reproducibility of the study: see above.

Response: ok, have been seen and corrected

6. Statistics: see above.

Response: ok, corrected

7. References:

- No specific information about psychiatric consequences of landslide is presented. Some of the papers discovered by a quick search in PubMed with the following keywords 'prevalence', 'PTSD' and 'landslide' have not been included, one of the a systematic review (Kennedy et al, PLOS Curr 2015;7).

Response: Thank you for your recommendation and giving sample of references. So now included the concepts (Page 2)

- Some concerns about the adequacy of the cited references with examples as the paper of Atwoli et al (reference nº 15). It is stated that "A recent community-based study in South Africa showed that trauma exposure is higher in lower-income countries compared with high-income countries which resulted in a high rate of PTSD(15)", but that paper is a review, not a community-based study.

Response: Thank you!! It was misunderstanding and now we state it was review of articles studies among community in South Africa.

- References format should be improved, e.g. references numbers 30, 34, and 40 among others.

Response: corrected

8. Presentation of results:

- There is a total confusion on the table order and description. Sociodemographic variables are referred to table 1 in the text, but it corresponds to table 4. No mention is included to table 3 in the text.

Response: I will ask great excuse. It is not deliberately/negligence, the problem happened while uploading the file (Having two similar file name). Now corrected

- Results of the multivariate analyses are described as a mere list of those variables with a p-value less than 0.05 presented in table 4 in the text, but it really corresponds to table 3 and the presentation might be more descriptive, e.g. including the range of odds ratios.

Response: corrected, the interpretation is now added

- Included figures do not add any value and could be included in the text and figure 1 is difficult to interpret.

Response: ok, figures removed since it is stated with text

- The format of the tables should be improved to allow readers to interpret them independently from the text and homogeneity through all of them should be warranted, e.g. number of decimals, foot-notes

Response: ok

9. Discussion and conclusions: The specific characteristics of the analyzed catastrophe (a garbage landslide) and the potential impact in PTSD prevalence compared to other human or natural disasters have not been mentioned.

Response: Now modified and stated

10. . Limitations: authors only reflect three limitations, but do not mention one of the principal concerns about the representativeness of the participants.

Response: now included

11. Supplementary reporting: It would be very important to follow the STROBE statement for reporting observational studies.

Response: we have used this checklist for our cross sectional study

12. Written English: it should be reviewed by a native English speaker, e.g. the description of Strengths and limitations of the study. Due to the infrequency of the studied disaster, if authors respond to comments and make a major revision of the document, editor might consider it to be suitable for publication.

Response: we have tried to edit the language online language editing system

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Fernando Navarro-Mateu Unidad de Docencia, Investigación y Formación en Salud Mental (UDIF-SM). Servicio Murciano de Salud. IMIB-Arrixaca. CIBER-Esp. Murcia (Spain)
REVIEW RETURNED	09-Apr-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Authors have included most of the revisors? suggestions. However, a new revisión should be implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the manuscript should be reviewed by a native English speaker. 2) general format of the manuscript should be reviewed (doublé spaces between words, very short paragraphs, ...). 3) The origin of household list is not clearly stated so it is difficult to decided about the representativeness of the sample selected. 4) It is not clear the rationale of the cut-off point of the PTSD scale used. 5) The paragraphs describing the "Study Variables" should be included in the posterior description of the sacles 6) Tables' format should be improved (e.g. Table 4 should included % with the absolute numbers and the " ** " should appear in all significant 95%CI in COR column and the significance of COR and AOR should be described. 7)Figure 1 do not add any particular information. 8) Format references should be reviewed
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Atsushi Sakuma Tohoku University Hospital
REVIEW RETURNED	15-Apr-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Although the authors have revised some of the manuscript, many of the suggestion raised by the reviewers seems to be unsolved.</p> <p>For example, description about the Koshe landslide (P2 lines 27 to 42) lacks important details about the disaster, such as number of victims or economic impact. Further, since this was a garbage landslide, it cannot simply be considered as "natural" disaster. Therefore, it is still difficult to understand the special characteristics of this disaster. If this manuscript is to be revised, the authors are advised to reexamine about the disaster thoroughly and reconstruct the manuscript accordingly.</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

First of all I thank you for your constructive comments!! and here below is my answer for questions

1. Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': Non declared.

Response: we have stated in the declaration section of the main document

2. The manuscript should be reviewed by a native English speaker.

Response: Reviewed by fluent speaker

3. General format of the manuscript should be reviewed (double spaces between words, very short paragraphs, ...).

Response: we have corrected both the double spaces and short paragraphs

4. The origin of household list is not clearly stated so it is difficult to decide about the representativeness of the sample selected.

Response: The list of the household obtained from kebeles/wards/office and health extension workers.

5. It is not clear the rationale of the cut-off point of the PTSD scale used.

Response: PTSD was measured with PCL-C version comprising 17 items that correspond to the key Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM)-IV symptoms of PTSD. The total symptom severity score ranges from 17-85 obtained by summing the scores from each of the 17 items, which had response options ranging from (1) "Not at all" to (5) "Extremely" and with a cut-off ≥ 50 on PCL treated as a predictor of PTSD. symptoms.

6. The paragraphs describing the "Study Variables" should be included in the posterior description of the studies

Response: we have included paragraphs which state about study variables particularly dependent variable to measurements regarding PTSD

7. Tables' format should be improved (e.g. Table 4 should include % with the absolute numbers and the " ** " should appear in all significant 95%CI in COR column and the significance of COR and AOR should be described.

Response: Now the percentage included. But we assumed including the percentage is not necessary because we can estimate the COR with absolute numbers. As a comment we accept and included since it has no problem. The "***" has added in the COR column and the significance for both COR and AOR was taken p-value < 0.05 . This description is explained under the table

8. Figure 1 do not add any particular information.

Response: ok, I removed, everybody can easily understand people who have no PTSD since it is dichotomy, Thank you for your constructive comment!!

9. Format references should be reviewed

Response: Thank you, reviewed

Reviewer: 2

First of all I thank you for your constructive comments! and here below is my answer for questions

1. Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Response: we have stated in the declaration section of the main document

.....many of the suggestion raised by the reviewers seems to be unsolved.

2. For example, description about the Koshe landslide (P2 lines 27 to 42) lacks important details about the disaster, such as number of victims or economic impact.

Response: Now all issues regarding number of victims and impact are added in the main document and highlighted

3. Further, since this was a garbage landslide, it cannot simply be considered as "natural" disaster. Therefore, it is still difficult to understand the special characteristics of this disaster.

Response: of course, it is not natural disaster. It is human made disaster. Now the confusion is clear in the main document. Thank you for the comment!!

4. If this manuscript is to be revised, the authors are advised to reexamine about the disaster thoroughly and reconstruct the manuscript accordingly.

Response: ok, we tried to modify everything