

Review of: "The Effect of Visual Arts Educative Practices on Social Functionality in Patients With Schizophrenia"

Elisabetta Farina¹

¹ Fondazione Don Carlo Gnocchi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thanks to the author for publishing a paper about a very interesting subject: Can we help patients with schizophrenia improve their social functioning by using visual arts? I congratulate the authors because it seems to me that an English revision was made. Good English is very important and adds clarity to the text, which seemed obscure at different points in the first paper version.

However, I'd suggest the authors carefully revise the printing format of the text (e.g., in the tables, there are many writing errors) and use the third plural person (they) in place of the singular masculine one in order to be inclusive (there are female patients with schizophrenia).

Abstract

I find that speaking in the abstract about the study population and study sample is confusing. I'd report only the study sample in the abstract, and I'd refer to the study population only in the body of the text. In the same vein, the information about informed consent would also be better placed only in the body of the article.

On the other hand, the abstract should contain more information about study results.

Introduction

All the history about the different terms used to indicate "schizophrenia" is unnecessary to the article. I'd keep the focus of the paper on effects of visual arts on this patient category.

Research Problems

I'd suggest shortening this part and stating the research question in a more synthetic and simpler way.

Method

In my opinion, the authors should better explain how the study sample was selected from the original population of 196 patients.

The paragraph "Population and Sample/Study Group/Participants" is a little repetitive and contains pieces of information which are not clear to me: e.g., was the study sample formed by 30 (as stated before) or 35 subjects? Were the two groups formed with a case-control method or through randomization? It's not clear to me yet, even if the actual paper

version is better than the first one.

Data analysis

I think that shortening this paragraph would help clarity for readers. Moreover, some pieces of information are repeated more and more times. This is not necessary.

Validity and reliability

This paragraph seems unnecessary to me.

Results

Maybe it's unnecessary to repeat all the information in Table 2 also in the text.

In my opinion, it would be better to report results in a far more synthetic way (repeating always the same sentence with very little changes doesn't favor attention).

The Authors should precise that all the sub-analyses must be taken into account with a lot of caution, as some subgroups are really small (e.g., there are only 5 female patients). In general, the Authors should also precise that their study is a preliminary one, due to the small size of the experimental sample.

References

There are a lot of Turkish references. Could the Authors add more references from other countries?

Thank you so much for the cooperation.