PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 64575

Title: Gene × Environment Interaction in Major Depressive Disorder

Reviewer's code: 02548382

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-08 06:41

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-08 12:38

Review time: 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
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: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting, but ruined by poor English. An example, in the same page: "It was showed that such a developmental cascade of experiences was a leading cause to women's MDD[31]." You mean It was shown that such e developmental cascade of experiences was a major contributor to women's MDD. "THEORETICAL FRAMWORKS OF GENE×ENVIRONMENT INTREAACTION" --> THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF GENE×ENVIRONMENT INTERACTION. "Furthermore, if individuals who do not carry genetic vulnerability, either as the function of not succumbing to the negative effects of environmental influences or due to the presence of some protective factors are deemed resilience" does not make sense. I cannot correct it because I do not understand what you mean. The above are few examples of improperly formulated sentences of which the manuscript is full. While the structure and the flow are good, the too many errors make reading difficult. I recommend that you should rewrite it, paing attention to othography, grammar, syntax, and choice of the appropriate words to use for each concept.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 64575

Title: Gene × Environment Interaction in Major Depressive Disorder

Reviewer's code: 05239915

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-13 11:35

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-22 05:59

Review time: 8 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] 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

It seems to be a review that summarizes Gene×environment interaction in MDD. The manuscript is generally well organized concisely. Just to point out the very simple, 1. Please describe the full names of GWEIS and SHARs. 2. And I hope to correct the word "tansdiagnostic" in the FUTURE DIRECTIONS part.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 64575

Title: Gene × Environment Interaction in Major Depressive Disorder

Reviewer's code: 02548382

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-20

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-15 18:46

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-15 19:05

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper improved, although there are still some minor language problems.