

Dear Dr. Tampi,

Thank you for this evaluation of our manuscript whose title has been changed to “Menopause and cognitive impairment: a narrative review of current knowledge” (ID: 64361) and for the opportunity to resubmit the paper. The title was changed according to the suggestion of one of the reviewers. We are grateful to the reviewers for their extremely helpful comments, all of which have been considered in this revised version of the paper.

We appreciate the invitation to write a review for the World Journal of Psychiatry.

All changes have been inserted into the body of the manuscript. They have also been listed separately in detail in the attached letter, which contains our point-by-point responses to the reviewers’ questions and required editorial comments.

A native English speaker experienced with medical translations reviewed the entire manuscript.

Should any further explanations be required, we are at your complete disposal. We look forward to receiving your comments on this revised version of the manuscript and hope that it will now be considered suitable for publication.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Délio Marques Conde, MD, PhD

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology,

Federal University of Goiás, Goiânia, Goiás, Brazil

Menopause and cognitive impairment: a narrative review of current knowledge

World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 64361

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: As you addressed in p. 22, different studies use different data and this would lead to conflicting results. Building big data and using data-driven approaches such as machine learning would help to resolve this issue. I would like to suggest you to elaborate in the end of Discussion how to create more concrete evidence on this important topic.

Response: Thanks for the suggestion.

- We have elaborated on this topic in the discussion, as suggested by the reviewer.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This paper entitled "Menopause and cognitive impairment: what we know and what we do not know" seems to have been generally well executed and written. Furthermore, I believe that this topic would be very interesting to the readers. However, I have a few concerns that requires authors attention. Title The title should be more informative and therefore, should be rephrased, such as "Menopause and cognitive impairment: a narrative review of current knowledge in 2021". Methods Methods section that include in detail how the literature was searched must be present (which databases, period of time, used MeSH terms, human studies and/or animal studies, author who approved the final list of included studies and by which criteria the studies were included and excluded,...). Also, you must define which type of the review that you have performed. I assume that the current paper represents the narrative review. Finally, your paper includes only one

possible cause of cognitive impairment (i.e., menopause). At least, other possible causes of cognitive decline should be listed in your text.

Response: Thanks for the comments and suggestions.

- After considering the comments of Reviewer 2 and Science Editor, the title of the article was modified. We decided to revise the title to "Menopause and cognitive impairment: a narrative review of current knowledge" to ensure that it is not excessively long. We believe that this title addresses the reviewer's concern and clearly expresses the content of the review.
- We have inserted the Methods section in the manuscript describing how the articles were searched and selected. Notably, we conducted a narrative review based on an invitation from the journal.
- We clarify that this article is a narrative review. This information is now clearly indicated in the revised version of the manuscript and was stated in the title and in the methods section.
- Other possible causes of cognitive decline were listed.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This is an invited review of menopausal effects on cognition. This is an important topic and will be of interest to readers when the English is improved and when the material is better organized. I suggest that the authors have it checked by a native English speaker after revision. I also suggest that the review be organized around a central question - for instance, the important question of whether hormone replacement therapy a) aids cognition perimenopausally and b) prevents dementia at later ages. Once the question is determined, the literature search strategy (under a Methods section) should explain how the papers best related to the question were chosen - which were included, which excluded. After the findings and recommendations sections, there needs to be a discussion about how well or poorly these agree with the findings and recommendations of others. There should then be a Limitations section addressing comprehensiveness, potential bias, the quality of the papers selected.....The conclusions should include the answer to the initial question.

Response: Thanks for the comments and suggestions.

- A native English speaker extensively proofread the complete translation. We further clarify that the manuscript was reviewed by American Journal Experts (AJE), who issued a certificate submitted to the World Journal of Psychiatry, along with the article.

- The Methods section was inserted in the revised manuscript, where we describe how the articles were searched and selected for this narrative review. We believe that we should clarify that we were invited to write a narrative review. In this sense, we did not follow the guidelines of a systematic review, which has different stages from those of a narrative review. We have clearly stated that the article is a narrative review in the revised version of the manuscript.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) **Science editor:** 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a review of the menopause and cognitive impairment. The topic is within the scope of the WJP. (1) Classification: Grade B, Grade C and Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors found an important topic and will be of interest to readers. The manuscript is generally well executed and written. However, the questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 4 tables and 4 figures. (4) References: A total of 101 references are cited, including 16 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are no self-cited references; and (6) References recommend: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by peer reviewer(s), especially the references published by the peer reviewer(s) themselves. If the authors found the peer reviewer(s) request the authors to cite improper references published by themselves, please send the peer reviewer's ID number to the editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A, Grade B and Grade A. A language editing certificate issued by AJE was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The study was supported by 1 grant. The topic has not previously been published in the WJP. 5 Issues raised: (1) The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words; (2) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); (3) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be

reprocessed by the editor; and (4) Please obtain permission for the use of picture(s). If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: We thank the Science Editor for the comments.

- After considering the comments of Science Editor and Reviewer 2, the title of the article was modified. We revised the title to "Menopause and cognitive impairment: a narrative review of current knowledge" to ensure that it was not excessively long. The title contains less than 18 words. We believe that this title clearly expresses the content of the review.
- We have uploaded the grant approval document.
- Figure 1 has been removed.