



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

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous 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

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous 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 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

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous 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

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.