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Reviewer’s report:

The article reports about a cross-sectional study describing the prevalence of PTSD and the use of coping strategies in a sample of earthquake survivors. The topic is relevant from a public health perspective, and the study design appropriate.

The manuscript presents however some limitations, that are addressed in the comments below.

Some sentences in results and discussion evoke causal relationships, which are not possible to draw with a cross-sectional descriptive design, and should be reformulated.

The description of results in the text often does not match with what is reported in the corresponding tables.

In general, in my opinion the quality of written English needs revision.

I hope that the following comments will be helpful in improving the manuscript.

The lacking of page numbers in the document makes it difficult to refer to the correct section of the manuscript. I will refer to the page number of the pdf.

Abstract

It might be important to mention the time point of data collection (10 months after the earthquake) also in the methods section of the abstract.

Background

Pag 4, line 13: please define "VDC" the first time it is used

line 18: "8702 people died while 22493 were left seriously injured"

Line 20: "causes a suffering"

Line 32: "resulting in a wide range"
Line 39: "several studies"

Line 58: "and substance use."

**Methods**

Pag 5: the authors may explain better how the sample size was calculated

Pag 6 line 11: "were developed after an extensive literature review". The authors could better explain if the socio-demographic questions were developed specifically for this study and by whom.

Line 15: please give a name and a reference for the checklist

Line 15: "coping strategies were measured"

Line 26: "validity and reliability of both tools have been documented": please give references

Line 34: please define PCL-5 checklist the first time used

In general, the description of the tools for data extraction is not very clear. Is the PCL-5 checklist the one according to DSM-5 criteria? Is the Interview Schedule (line 40) the one developed by the study authors (line 11)?

Line 58: "Then participants with a score of 38 or higher were classified as having PTSD, and participants with a score lower than 38 as not having PTSD"

Pag 7, line 11: "Data were interpreted"

**Results**

Line 57: the most important socio-demographic information should also be described in the text, and not only presented in tables.

Table 1: please consider that the note "b" is used two times

Page 9, Line 4: Please give a reference for "MOE 201"

Table 2: please explain how the adequacy of the support was evaluated

Line 53: "Substance use coping was the less frequently used coping strategy"

Line 55: "(Table 5)."
Table 4 and 5 could be done with the same style, for consistency (e.g., reporting S.E and Confidence Intervals also in Table 5)

Pag 11, line 6: "significant statistical association with PTSD was observed for age…"

The non-significant associations should also be mentioned in the text.

Association between PTSD and educational status is p<.0001 in the text and p=0.127 in Table 6.

The information about participants being inside the home during the earthquake seems not to be reported in any Table.

Line 12: "those who were injured because of earthquake (p=0.003) (Table 7)."

Pag 12, line 41: "adult survivors (Table 8). Religious coping was found to be significantly higher in elderly adults, females and illiterates".

Married/unmarried status is not contained in any table.

Line 48: "Passive coping was higher"

Line 49: "active coping was significantly higher among the younger, the males and the literate."

Inconsistency between text and with information in table 8: SDC coping is higher in literates.

Table 8: the information about educational status are on different lines, please correct formatting

Pag 13, line 46: inconsistency between text and table 9 for SDC coping.

Discussion

Was data collection performed 10 months after the earthquake? This information should be given also in the methods section.

Line 45: "This finding is in agreement/in line with studies conducted in China and Italy"

Line 51: the information "PTSD was present in more than the half (68.8%) of female survivors" is not consistent with what reported in Table 6, where the percentage of female with PTSD is 31.2, and 68.8 is the percentage of female without PTSD.

Line 55-59: please justify this hypothesis/interpretation, that in my view exceeds the findings of the present study

Pag 15 line 13-14: In table 6 the percentage of literate survivors is 13.9 and not 9.7, and illiterate 25.5 and not 38.1.
Line 30-31: "the most frequently used coping strategy"

Line 33: "the less frequently used"

Line 35: "It reveals the fact": interpretation of results cannot draw so straight conclusions. An alternative wording could be "A possible interpretation of this finding could be that…"

Line 51: "Nepalese people are more religious" in comparison with..?

Pag 16, line 21: table 9 reported no significant differences for social coping

Line 32: In table 8 there are no differences between literates and illiterates in the use of social coping, but there is a difference in the use of self-distraction coping.

I would not comment results saying "This signifies that", what author can do is to hypothesize a possible interpretation for the findings, and not draw straight conclusions.

Line 45: "the study findings reveal"

Line 52: in Table 9 it is the contrary, people WITH PTSD employ SDC more frequently

Pag 17, line 28: "maladaptive coping strategies are associated with higher prevalence of PTSD"

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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