

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 64361

**Title:** Menopause and cognitive impairment: a narrative review of current knowledge

**Reviewer's code:** 00784262

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** DSc, FRCP (C), MD

**Professional title:** Emeritus Professor, Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-10 16:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-10 17:13

**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 Grade E: Do not publish            |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>Re-review</b>                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No   |
| <b>Peer-reviewer statements</b> | Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |



**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>

#### **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.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 64361

**Title:** Menopause and cognitive impairment: a narrative review of current knowledge

**Reviewer's code:** 05322345

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-11 16:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-11 20:13

**Review time:** 3 Hours

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Scientific quality</b>       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

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

#### **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.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 64361

**Title:** Menopause and cognitive impairment: a narrative review of current knowledge

**Reviewer's code:** 05126185

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-10 01:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-17 02:17

**Review time:** 7 Days and 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<br><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<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 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<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No   |

#### **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.