

# Review of: "Is Data Panel Beneficial for Mental Health Assessment? Application of Pyecharts Library"

Luis Felipe Dias Lopes<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Federal de Santa Maria

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the invitation to review the article entitled: Is Data Panel Beneficial for Mental Health Assessment? Application of Pyecharts Library.

I begin to question the ABSTRACT: it should contain the objective, the method, the main results and finally the conclusion with the relevance of this research.

Now the INTRODUCTION. I suggest that it be separated from the THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, that is, contextualize and finalize with the objective of the research. And the theoretical framework contextualizes the theme by relating it to the applied scales.

I suggest that a METHOD chapter be created, as this is where researchers will be able to learn about the technique used, the scales used with their respective authors, the statistical techniques used to analyze the results. The profile of the respondents and, mainly, the ethical aspects of research.

Figure 1, I suggest that it be presented in the results, as well as that the resolution be improved. Chapters 2 and 3 are a hodgepodge of method with results, I suggest the authors improve their presentation.

Figure 3, I suggest improving its resolution.

As for Figures 4 and 5, I suggest that they be redone, because unfortunately, because it is a scientific article that is being published in the English language, characters in Chinese are presented in the figures, without the slightest possible form of understanding.

Finally, I see many REFERENCES and little DISCUSSION, it was observed that the findings of the article were not discussed, so I see weaknesses in the sense of replication and citation. The conclusion is weakened due to the lack of discussion, therefore I suggest a new round, and that the article be redone according to the international rules of scientific articles (ABSTRACT, INTRODUCTION, CONTEXTUALIZATION, METHOD, RESULTS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION and REFERENCES).

It was also observed in the REFERENCES that the authors used ET AL, starting from the first author and with TWO POINTS (Florencio, F., et al.) . I suggest that this be reviewed as per the APA.

My opinion is that the ARTICLE is currently not in conditions of publication.

