

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 59405

**Title:** Healthy individuals vs. patients with bipolar or unipolar depression in gray matter volume

**Reviewer's code:** 02785637

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DDS, MSc

**Professional title:** Adjunct Professor, Research Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-09-10

**Reviewer chosen by:** Le Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-11-20 14:32

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-11-25 16:00

**Review time:** 5 Days and 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors aimed to use voxel-based morphometry (VBM) to analyze the whole-brain gray matter volume (GMV) data of patients with untreated bipolar disorder (BD) and unipolar depression (UD) compared with healthy controls. The study covers some issues that have been overlooked in other similar topics. The structure of the manuscript appears adequate and well divided in the sub-paragraphs. Some issues should be improved: Please provide the ethics committee number. Several typos should be corrected thorough the text. Conclusion Section is missing. Is necessary to add it (moving from discussion section), including some "take-home message".