

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 82852

Title: DHEA supplementation in health and diseases

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03908850

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: BSc, MD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Scientist, Staff Physician, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-24 17:32

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-24 17:53

Review time: 1 Hour

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the possibility to review the mansucrpt titled: "DHEA supplementation in health and disease". The topic of the manscript is interesting and easy to read. This is indeed an important topic as DHEA is abundantly available on the market and is a popular supplement. However, there are several important points, which should be reviewed: -Please review the language of the manuscript. There are multiple type mistakes. -The phrase "we critically review evidence on DHEAS supplemenation" is somewhat vague. A critical revision usually implies a systematic review or at least presence of multiple manuscripts that contradict the main theory. I would change this phrase or add more iformation of the possible negative effects of DHEAS. -The abstract is short and does not represent the manuscript in its full. Please add the conditions which are listed in the manuscript (for example Corlateanu and coworkers. Prevalence and burden of comorbidities in Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. Respir Investig. 2016 Nov;54(6):387-396 have an abstract which includes all of the condition mentioned in the manuscript) The cardiovascular section deserves more attention. There have been reports about DHEAS and fatal arrhythmias and other risk factors. Please provide more



negative information in other subchapters since otherwise all of the data is only positive (for example Zozina VI et al. Coenzyme Q10 in COPD: An Unexplored Opportunity? COPD. 2021 Feb;18(1):114-122. doi: 10.1080/15412555.2020.1849084) Table 1 has little sense as there is only one column. Please add other columns such as trials which indicated that there is an effect, or possible effects and side effects. Otherwise the table is small and has no important data. "Therefore, DHEA and DHEAS are useful markers of adrenal androgen secretion and the onset of adrenarche. Thereafter, levels of DHEA and DHEAS progressively" Therefore is used repeatedly, change to another term. "Can add mechanism: intracrinology Current recommendation ??" I believe that this requires editing. Please take into account the recommendations in the spirit of improving the quality of the submission.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO: 82852

Title: DHEA supplementation in health and diseases

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05262034

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Physician, Research Scientist, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist,

Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-24 17:06

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-24 18:56

Review time: 1 Hour

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[Y] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [Y] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The 'Core tip' as well as 'adverse effects' look like two paragraphs taken from a leaflet. generic and useless for scientific purposes. The 'search strategy' does not actually represent a real search strategy. For example, you could do a systematic review based on the amount of data you have, not just a list of notions that have been known for decades.