



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 71000

**Title:** Identification and predictive analysis for participants at ultra-high risk of psychosis: A comparison of three psychometric diagnostic interviews

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**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:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-10-15 13:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-10-15 13:46

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<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](http://www.wjgnet.com)

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a very fine comparison study among three screening currently used instruments for At-Risk schizophrenia. The study was well conducted and clearly reported. Essentially, all three proved comparable with good inter-rater reliability. My only suggestion is to replace the word "subjects" when referring to the interviewed relatives and to call them instead "study participants" or "participants."



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 71000

**Title:** Identification and predictive analysis for participants at ultra-high risk of psychosis: A comparison of three psychometric diagnostic interviews

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04881496

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-09-29

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-10-14 08:57

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-10-25 12:00

**Review time:** 11 Days and 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 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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



**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

<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**

Respected authors, this is a well written paper and covers an interesting topic. To my knowledge, there hasn't been a paper which explores the three psychometric tools in regard to the specific UHR population. The only remark is a relatively old population for UHR and I think that should be mentioned as a limitation in the text, as it could affect the end result. I don't have any other remarks except that the English could be a bit polished.