# ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Psychiatry
**ESPS manuscript NO:** 30033
**Title:** Functional neuroanatomy in panic disorder: Status quo of the research
**Reviewer's code:** 02445281
**Reviewer's country:** Mexico
**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong
**Date sent for review:** 2016-09-05 12:17
**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-07 02:28

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

"Functional Neuroanatomy in Panic Disorder – Status Quo of the Research"   Comment. This is a wide, very nice review. The document is very well written and documented.     Surely, it must be of interest for WJP readers.   I have only two observations.   1. Check the manuscript, there are some typewriting mistakes, e.g., patter   (p. 16), fasculi (p. 18).   2. Please, reduce abbreviations to a minimum. In many parts of the manuscript abbreviations are used a couple of times in the same paragraph, making some sections hard to follow.

# ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is, in summary, an interesting review manuscript aimed to provide a detailed and comprehensive overview of the current research in the functional neuroanatomy of panic disorder. The authors mainly focused on recent neurofunctional, neurostructural, and neurochemical studies about the specified topic. They concluded that it is conceivable that new research advances may lead in the near future to the development of clinically useful tools like predictive biomarkers or novel treatment options. The authors may find as follows my comments/suggestions. First, throughout the Introduction section when the authors stated that antipanic drugs such as tricyclic antidepressants or MAO inhibitors block brainstem-provoked panic attacks, that other treatments like benzodiazepines and relaxation training reduce anticipatory anxiety via the limbic system, and desensitization and cognitive therapies relieve phobic avoidance by influencing functions of the prefrontal cortex, they could also report that recent antidepressant medications seem to be able to enhance neuroplasticity mechanisms and adult neurogenesis in the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex. In addition, most of the commonly available antidepressants lacked efficacy and tolerability for patients with major depressive disorder. Among all antidepressant drugs predominantly acting

through monoaminergic mechanisms, some recent psychoactive compounds are of particular interest due to another alternative mechanism of action able to enhance neuroplasticity mechanisms. For this purpose, i suggest to cite the paper of Pompili and colleagues  which was published on World Journal of Biological Psychiatry in 2013. Moreover, there are statements within the same section such as "many patients with PD suffer from anticipatory anxiety and maladaptive changes in cognition and behavior resulting in phobic avoidance" or "different treatments for panic disorder and agoraphobia not only affect different parts of the illness but also different parts of the brain" or "by today there are numerous neurofunctional, neurostructural, and neurochemical studies, which have demonstrated the significant role of certain structures in the fear network" that need to be supported by adequate references.  In addition, within the Methods section, there are some missing details/information that should be more clearly elucidated. For instance, how many and which key words have been specified by the authors during their search is a matter of debate. In addition, how many articles have been first screened, selected, and finally included into their search needs to be specified. The inclusion of the Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses" (PRISMA) guidelines summarizing the most relevant results of the search strategy (identification, screening, eligibility, and inclusion process) used for selecting studies and aimed to achieve a high standard of reporting would significantly ameliorate this section. Overall, the Results section is, in my opinion, too long and difficult to follow for the general readership, thus i sincerely suggest to insert one/more Tables throughout the main text in order to enhance its readability.   In addition, throughout the first lines of the Discussion section, the authors do not need to report for another time what is the main aim of the manuscript (this has been already specified before). Lastly, what is the final take-home message? The authors should insert some conclusive remarks and a general summary of their wide overview about the main topic. This would be highly appreciated by the general readership.