

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 68651

Title: Catatonia in older adults: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05906528

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-30 21:41

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-07 01:37

Review time: 7 Days and 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 Grade E: Do not publish |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 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 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 | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous |



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, a very comprehensive review. Authors have put in a lot of effort in reviewing the literature pertinent to the topic. However, there seems to be some excessive repetition of points in the main body, discussion as well as in the conclusions sections. The discussion section can be made more concise. There is inconsistency in the way the authors are referring to the previously published articles and case reports. That can be improved further. Please find attached the word document with further queries and notes.