

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Relevance: Moderated

Novelty: Moderated

Presentation and writing: Moderated

Comments for authors: Be as accurate as possible when making your comments. List each recommendation so that it is easy for authors to respond appropriately to each one. Indicate in a timely manner where changes should be made (i.e. paragraph 2 of the method section).

The manuscript is interesting and provides a review of stress, its implications and its causes. However, some aspects need to be improved before publication.

Major observations:

1. The manuscript requires a thorough revision in the English language writing.
2. I consider the explanation of the section "Neurobiology and endocrinology of psychological stress" to be too brief. Please expand this section. There is a lot of basic research on the subject.
3. I am surprised by the absence of a subsection discussing the various measurement tools available for assessing psychological stress. Such a subsection would greatly benefit readers, providing them with valuable information on valid and reliable tools that can be utilized for research purposes. In addition to psychometric scales, it would be intriguing to explore biofeedback tools employed to address pathophysiological issues associated with stress. At present, there exist numerous systematic reviews on widgets and wearables designed to monitor stress levels in real time.
4. The author refers to stress and psychological stress, please explain the difference or whether they are the same construct. It is also necessary to clarify how psychological stress differs from other types of stress, such as perceived stress or related constructs. The main idea is to have a definition of psychological stress and why it is substantially different from other similar constructs.
5. It is essential to include a short section in the manuscript explaining the methodology used, especially in the case of a narrative review. The author should explicitly state that the content was selected ad hoc and that no systematic literature search was conducted. In addition, it should be made clear whether inclusion criteria were not applied to the included studies. If these aspects have not been accurately addressed in the manuscript, it is recommended to review and revise the manuscript accordingly. My recommendation corresponds to the third item of the Scale for the Assessment of Narrative Review Articles (SANRA).
6. After using SANRA to assess the quality of the narrative review, certain aspects were identified that the author should address for improvement. Firstly, it is essential to clarify the rationale for undertaking the review. The author should clearly articulate the importance, novelty and relevance of the study to the scientific community. Explaining why a narrative study on the given topic is necessary will help the readers to understand the purpose and motivation behind the narrative review.
7. Second, the aim of the review is not stated in the manuscript. This increases the ambiguity about what is new or systematised in the study. I strongly suggest that this section be improved.
8. I suggest that the author apply the SANRA to his or her own manuscript to identify whether it meets the quality indicators: <https://researchintegrityjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s41073-019-0064-8>

AUTHORS' RESPONSE

Dear reviewer,

Thank you very much for your observations, they have helped us a lot to improve the quality of the article. We have attended to them and highlighted every added content in yellow. Here we describe how we have approached every observation:

Observation 1. The manuscript requires a thorough revision in the English language writing.

We have revised the writing of the English language. We have checked it and we consider that it has improved. In any case, we are open to new suggestions on the matter.

Observation 2. I consider the explanation of the section "Neurobiology and endocrinology of psychological stress" to be too brief. Please expand this section. There is a lot of basic research on the subject.

This section has been expanded and rewritten completely in order to meet a more accurate and complete description of the matter.

Observation 3. I am surprised by the absence of a subsection discussing the various measurement tools available for assessing psychological stress. Such a subsection would greatly benefit readers, providing them with valuable information on valid and reliable tools that can be utilized for research purposes. In addition to psychometric scales, it would be intriguing to explore biofeedback tools employed to address pathophysiological issues associated with stress. At present, there exist numerous systematic reviews on widgets and wearables designed to monitor stress levels in real time.

There is now a new subsection on that matter. We have addressed psychometric and physical medicine tools, including research regarding wearable instruments to measure stress in real time. We have only addressed general aspects of it, and we know that there is much more information about this, however, we do not want to delve too deeply into the topic since it is not the objective of the review, although we are open to improving it if necessary.

Observation 4. The author refers to stress and psychological stress, please explain the difference or whether they are the same construct. It is also necessary to clarify how psychological stress differs from other types of stress, such as perceived stress or related constructs. The main idea is to have a definition of psychological stress and why it is substantially different from other similar constructs.

There is now a better description of psychological stress and perceived stress in the subsection "Stress and stressors". We consider these concepts are now clear. As always, we are open to new discussions about it if necessary.

Observations 5 – 8:

5. It is essential to include a short section in the manuscript explaining the methodology used, especially in the case of a narrative review. The author should explicitly state that the content was selected ad hoc and that no systematic literature search was conducted. In addition, it should be made clear whether inclusion criteria were not applied to the included studies. If these aspects have not been accurately addressed in the manuscript, it is recommended to review and revise the manuscript accordingly. My recommendation corresponds to the third item of the Scale for the Assessment of Narrative Review Articles (SANRA).

6. After using SANRA to assess the quality of the narrative review, certain aspects were identified that the author should address for improvement. Firstly, it is essential to clarify the rationale for undertaking the review. The author should clearly articulate the importance, novelty and relevance of the study to the scientific community. Explaining why a narrative study on the given topic is necessary will help the readers to understand the purpose and motivation behind the narrative review.

7. Second, the aim of the review is not stated in the manuscript. This increases the ambiguity about what is new or systematised in the study. I strongly suggest that this section be improved.

López-Naranjo, F., Córdova-Moreno, R., & Heyerdahl-Viau, I. (2023). Brief review of pathophysiological disorders as consequence of psychological stress. *Interacciones*, 9, e327. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24016/2023.v9.327>

8. I suggest that the author apply the SANRA to his or her own manuscript to identify whether it meets the quality indicators: <https://researchintegrityjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s41073-019-0064-8>

We have reviewed the points set out by SANRA and, accordingly, have improved the justification and aim of the article in the introduction so that the intention and importance of the review is clearer. Additionally, we have also added a new methodology subsection in which we describe our search strategies in this narrative review.

We hope these additions improve the quality of the article. We wait your answer.

Sincerely,

Ivo Heyerdahl-Viau