

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 87125

**Title:** Cerebrotendinous xanthomatosis presenting with schizophrenia-like disorder: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03658366

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Academic Fellow, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-07-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-14 17:15

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-14 17:42

**Review time:** 1 Hour

|                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scientific quality                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty                                                 |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation                                |

|                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance                                         |
| <b>Language quality</b>                                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

1) The authors state in their letter to the editor: "We describe a case of CTX characterized by psychotic symptoms, and hallucinatory delusional syndrome was described for the first time in CTX." However, this has been described previously including in Berginer et al 1988 which they cite. I am also not sure how hallucinations and delusions are any different than psychosis. 2) Please replace all instances of "mental retardation" with "intellectual disability". 3) Please clarify the "episodes of depression" - whether she met criteria for major depressive disorder or whether these were brief spells of tearfulness and depressed mood (i.e. lability) 4) I am not sure if "isoslightly high" is the correct term- please clarify or replace 5) Please replace "common sense" with a more medical term (e.g. logic or judgment) 6) Please fix the grammar as there are many grammatical issues.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 87125

**Title:** Cerebrotendinous xanthomatosis presenting with schizophrenia-like disorder: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02729669

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Additional Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-07-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-08-13 02:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-08-15 08:39

**Review time:** 2 Days and 5 Hours

|                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scientific quality                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty                                                 |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation                                |

|                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair<br><input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance                                         |
| <b>Language quality</b>                                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection          |
| <b>Re-review</b>                                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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

a. What do you mean by “catamacts”? Do you mean cataract? b. Why valproate is given at a dose of 1000mg/day? c. It is very surprising that the patient presented with psychosis, improved with 5mg/day olanzapine. What diagnostic system was followed for the diagnosis of psychosis? d. What are the points in favor of diagnosis of psychosis? e. Was it an affective psychosis?

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 87125

**Title:** Cerebrotendinous xanthomatosis presenting with schizophrenia-like disorder: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02729669

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Additional Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-07-25

**Reviewer chosen by:** Cong Lin

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-09-07 03:26

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-09-07 03:36

**Review time:** 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<br><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<br><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)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection             |
| <b>Peer-reviewer</b>      | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous                                                                                                                                                     |



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ **Y** ] No

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

I am not convinced with the revision done. The abstract should mention about the psychiatric diagnosis (just mentioning psychotic symptoms, does not convey about the diagnosis). The manuscript text mentions the diagnosis mental disorder due to CTX. This diagnosis is nowhere there in the diagnostic system. Follow a standard diagnostic criteria (ICD or DSM) for using appropriate diagnostic category.