

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Neurology*

**Manuscript NO:** 82788

**Title:** Alcohol Intolerance and Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05504262

**Position:** Associate Editor

**Academic degree:** DA, DNB, MBBS, MNAMS

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-10 18:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-10 18:38

**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 <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 Grade E: Do not publish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 <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 <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



**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

<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 <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) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" 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

kindly resubmit the manuscript in proper format wit clear headings. The results are not discussed properly and discusion is very limited with the aims and objectives poorly highlighted. validation of survey questions not nentioned. References are limited.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Neurology*

**Manuscript NO:** 82788

**Title:** Alcohol Intolerance and Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03646555

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** FRACP, MBBS

**Professional title:** Attending Doctor, Lecturer, Staff Physician

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-27

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-28 11:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-04-01 01:54

**Review time:** 3 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 <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 <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 <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 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

1) The abstract is not written according to scientific convention and does not reflect the study methodology at all. The abstract should not be used as only an area to justify one aspect of this study (the fact that participants in the current study were asked whether they have avoided alcohol in the past 6 months). It should describe the participant numbers, the methodologies and questionnaires used, the statistical approaches. 2) Similarly, in the introduction, the whole paragraph "Surveys which ask respondents with ME/CFS whether they experienced alcohol intolerance within a recent time frame might produce inaccurate results, since respondents may indicate that the symptom was not present if they have avoided alcohol in the designated time frame [12]. Due to this concern, the instrument used in this study (DePaul Symptom Questionnaire-2) asks participants whether they have avoided alcohol in the past 6 months, and if they have, how severe their alcohol intolerance would be if they were to drink alcohol [12]. We suggest that a failure to account for the effect of question wording may partially explain the inconsistency in findings related to alcohol intolerance in ME/CFS" belongs in the methodology rather than the introduction. 3) In the methods, please ensure that the

DSQ-2 is introduced in full and described in detail, before it is referred to by an acronym.

4) "publically" should be spelled "publicly" 5) It is unclear why in the linear regression model the authors did not use SF-36 scores as variables as well as DSQ-2 domain scores.

6) In the results, the sentence "Of the 8 symptom domains, 5 domain scores were significantly different post-exertional malaise, cognitive impairment, pain, orthostatic intolerance, and temperature intolerance" does not specify the directionality of difference. I guess it is implied that those with alcohol intolerance had worse domain scores than those without alcohol intolerance. But it should be made explicitly clear. 7)

The sentence "Only the orthostatic intolerance domain significantly predicted alcohol intolerance ( $\beta = 0.21$ ,  $p = 0.01$ )" should read "Only the orthostatic intolerance domain significantly predicted alcohol intolerance severity ( $\beta = 0.21$ ,  $p = 0.01$ )", as this was a linear outcome rather than a binary categorical outcome.

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Neurology*

**Manuscript NO:** 82788

**Title:** Alcohol Intolerance and Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03646555

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** FRACP, MBBS

**Professional title:** Attending Doctor, Lecturer, Staff Physician

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Jie Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-04-15 03:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-04-15 03:08

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<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**

Acceptable responses to my previous queries.