

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 33518

Title: Catatonia as a putative nosological entity: A historical sketch

Reviewer's code: 03672830

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-05-05

Date reviewed: 2017-05-21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dr. Gazdag, Dr. Takács and Dr. Ungvari provided an insightful review of how catatonia evolved as a nosological entity in psychiatry since the time of Karl Ludwig Kahlbaum until the current diagnostic guidelines in DSM-5. As a "sketch" of this history, the authors achieved an appropriate depth of analysis using objective narratives. The logic and language in the main text are pleasant to chew on, and the abstract and core tips are accurate summaries of the essence of the article. Being a researcher working on CNS drug discovery, the reviewer himself thinks of the article as a mirror reflecting how the understanding and diagnosis of catatonia has grown through the work of generations of psychiatrists and started to gain contributions from modern approaches in biological psychiatry. Overall, the reviewer recommends acceptance of the article for publication. Below is a list of minor editorial points that the authors may want to consider: 1. The term "hebeprenic" should be "hebephrenic" according to the standard spelling in English 2. On page 5, "...his pioneering efforts to coalesced..." should probably be "...his pioneering efforts to coalesce..." 3. On page 5, "...in a host of psychiatric

disorders including mania[8,10,12,15], depression[10,11] infectious diseases, toxic states, delirium, mental retardation and syphilis[5,8].” Please consider revising the statement as “...in a host of psychiatric and non-psychiatric disorders including mania[8,10,12,15], depression[10,11], infectious diseases, toxic states, delirium, mental retardation and syphilis[5,8].” 4. On page 7, “ascribing him the simplified view that catatonia equals schizophrenia”. Please consider inserting “to” after “him”. 5. On page 8 “...only qualitatively different from normal movements, i.e. lacking any odd, bizarre quality”. Should “qualitatively” be replaced by “quantitatively”? 6. On page 10, the 1st sentence, the word “clinical” was misspelled. 7. On page 11, it might be better to spell out “Brief Psychiatry Rating Scale (BPRS)” instead of just the abbreviation for the benefit of a broader readership. 8. On page 12, at the end of the 1st paragraph “3 out of 12 common catatonic signs/symptoms. ” Would it be helpful to the broad readership if the authors make a table listing the 12 common catatonic signs in DSM-5?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 33518

Title: Catatonia as a putative nosological entity: A historical sketch

Reviewer's code: 02445281

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-05-19

Date reviewed: 2017-05-22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors did a nice revision about the old and new concepts of catatonia. In general, the paragraphs followed sequence and concepts achieve a very readable manuscript. I recommend the publication of this manuscript with only three suggestions. Main comments The manuscript needs an introduction and a conclusion sections. 1. Include some lines at the beginning of the manuscript dealing with current data of incidence and prevalence of catatonia. Probably there are very confusing data. These lines may reveal the interest and relevance of the theme, even in absence of these data. 2. Please, add an ending paragraph (not necessarily based on bibliography) dealing with conclusions, proposals and suggestions about the future lines of research and clinical concepts of catatonia. Additional comment 3. Please revise completely the manuscript. There are many mistakes in typing, orthography and syntaxes.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 33518

Title: Catatonia as a putative nosological entity: A historical sketch

Reviewer's code: 02445209

Reviewer's country: Czech Republic

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-05-19

Date reviewed: 2017-05-23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, I have a few comments on your manuscript: - The language is very good but I have found about 4 typing errors, you should revise this. - Your manuscript is a perfect historical sketch, but I would expect at least a few ideas as of a future research in the field of separate catatonia (see the last sentence of your manuscript). You should mention which research you suggest (e.g. whole-genome association studies, epigenetic studies, metabolomics and other "omics" etc.). The reviewer

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 33518

Title: Catatonia as a putative nosological entity: A historical sketch

Reviewer's code: 02445272

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2017-05-19

Date reviewed: 2017-05-27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I pointed out some typographical errors and some suggestions to ask more explanation of words in text. 1. Hebeprenic should be corrected to hebephrenic. 2. Clinjical should be corrected to clinical. 3. Continental Psychopathology and Anglo-Saxon psychiatry are unfamiliar for ordinary readers. So, these words should be explained in the text.