

65486-Answering Reviewers

Manuscript ID: 65486

Title: Alterations in blink and masseter reflex latencies in older adults with neurocognitive disorder and/or diabetes mellitus

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: I can not figure out what the authors mean with R1 R2. Many abbreviations were not introduced.

Response: missing abbreviations were added to the main manuscript

Science editor:

Paper ref. 65486 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript explores latencies of the blink and masseter reflexes in patients with neurocognitive disorders and type 2 diabetes. This index is suggested by authors to evaluate possible changes in brainstem circuits in older adults with these diseases. The topic is within the scope of the WJD.

(1) Classification: Grade D

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The scientific quality is fair. Some concepts/abbreviations should be clarified.

Response: missing abbreviations were added to the main manuscript

(3) Format: There are 3 tables and 2 figures;

(4) References: A total of 46 references are cited, including 6 references published in the last 4 years;

(5) Self-cited references: There are 2 self-cited references. The self-referencing rate is less than 10%.

(6) References recommendations: No references have been recommended by the peer reviewer.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate was provided.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, and the

Institutional Review Board Approval Form. No academic misconduct was found by the Google/Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. No financial support has been reported for the study.

5 Issues raised: The authors did not provide original pictures (Figures embedded in the manuscript).

Please provide the original figure files. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor

Response: Figures were attached in a new modifiable document in the requested format.

6 Re-Review: Not required. Please note the reviewer reported (“peer review statements”) the presence of conflict of interest (“Not my area of expertise”).

7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance. In my opinion, the manuscript needs a further revision by another expert reviewer.

Company editor-in-chief:

I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.

Response: We agree with this recommendation.