PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 86875

Title: Independent risk factors for depression in older adult patients receiving peritoneal dialysis for chronic kidney disease

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 07746578

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: New Zealand

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-05

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-07 00:22

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-12 10:12

Review time: 5 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is a retrospective study, the author prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. They investigated the independent risk factors for depression in elderly patients with CKD receiving peritoneal dialysis and provided a clinical basis for preventing depression in these patients in the future. The mental status of the 170 CKD patients who received peritoneal dialysis was assessed using BDI-I, SAS Anxiety Inventory Score, and PSQI scores. Logistic regression was also performed to analyze and explore the independent risk factors contributing to depression in the patients. Authors found that years of education, BDI-II, SAS, PSQI, DM, and CVD are independent risk factors for depression in elderly CKD patients; therefore, preventive measures and targeted interventions should be implemented to mitigate the risk of depression, particularly in high-risk individuals. Further research is needed to validate these findings and develop comprehensive strategies for preventing and managing depression in this population. The introduction gives a good overview about the topic and the procedures are precisely described. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion

sections. However, some issues have to be addressed: 1. In the material and metho, it is not stated which hospital the patient originated from; 2. The study population in this study is the elderly, and it is suggested to supplement "elderly patients" in the keywords; 3. The authors should provide the ethical statement in the manuscript; 4. Abbreviations in the Tables should include the full name in the comments.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. However, the background section needs to be re-written. This part of the current manuscript is not written research background, but the purpose of the study. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status, and significance of the study. The manuscript describes methods in adequate detail. The research objectives achieved by the experiments are used in this study. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion is accurate and it discuss the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. The style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate. Thank you for a useful and important synopsis of this important topic.