

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 64943

Title: The future of processing and facilitating change and learning

Reviewer's code: 05386374

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Austria

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-25

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-17 02:22

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-23 03:05

Review time: 6 Days

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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 statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Author, I read your manuscript “The future of processing and facilitating change and learning” with great interest. While the manuscript discusses an appealing topic, I came up with some issues: 1. First of all, the manuscript benefits from a good English form, but the general language is a bit hard to understand. I recommend replacing some hard-to-understand sentences with simpler ones. 2. In the fifth paragraph of the main text, a brief comparison has been made among different types of studies. Since the Cohort studies stay lower in the level of evidence pyramid, it is better to mention them apart from the RCTs and systematic reviews. Also, as both cohort and case-control studies benefit from predefined study designs, they are all-way above and somehow non-comparable to the case series and expert opinions in this context. 3. Some parts of the manuscript lacks integrity (e.g., the paragraph discussing Evidence-Based Medicine). Replacing these paragraphs or discussing more on the topic could be helpful. 4. The ethical issues are one of the limitations for the mentioned research fields, which could be discussed further in the manuscript.