



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 70087

**Title:** Personalized treatment - which interaction ingredients should be focused to capture the unconscious

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03604107

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-20 15:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-11-22 16:00

**Review time:** 2 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<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 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**

The paper is interesting; however important issues of concern arise: 1. Formally, I do not understand if this is a review or a case report. You start it differently from what it follows. 2. Wide discussions over psychoanalysis are never wide enough. I respect fully the (sub) discipline; but smooth your terminology. You're submitting for publication in a journal of psychiatry. Hence, address issues accordingly: the majority of readers will be psychiatrists. 3. Psychiatry has ever since suffered the lack of a unanimous / uniform language. Do not add confusion to all of this: some terms are hard to catch under a medical point of view (reconsolidation of memories / capture the unconscious / micro-expressions / painful sacrifices ...) Be more didactic and careful with the structure of the paper: introduction / methodology / discussion / conclusion; relating the latter I would re-write entirely the CONCLUSION: Taken together, both the motivation and the ability to influence one's life condition have to be freed to increase self-efficacy and a pleasurable pursuit of life. In psychoanalytic thinking, conflicting motives and/or goals demanding painful sacrifices need to be considered when initially effective interventions fail to induce a relevant change in the end. Social and other contextual external factors or inborn predispositions apply when problem solving fails. .... If you talk about treatment (right in the title) I see little about treating in these few sentences of the conclusion.