



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 14253

Title: The Effects of Music and Music Therapy on Mood in Neurological Patients.

Reviewer's code: 02976917

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-09-28 20:50

Date reviewed: 2014-11-19 00:06

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a comprehensive review of MT interventions in mediating depression and mood states in patients with neurological disorders. The article is clearly written and should be easily understood even by a reader without background in this research. There are a few odd phrases, possibly a translation issue (e.g., pg. 12 "Other five studies,..."), and occasionally wordiness (e.g., pg 13 "The results come to light that music-based..." could simply be "Music-based...") but these are minor. Because each research study is presented as a paragraph, it would be helpful to have a short summary at the end of each main section of the paper that highlights similarities and differences in the reported research.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 14253

Title: The Effects of Music and Music Therapy on Mood in Neurological Patients.

Reviewer's code: 02460675

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-09-28 20:50

Date reviewed: 2014-11-28 11:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 would like to congratulate the authors of this submitted paper to an important piece of research. I have the following comments to make which might possibly improve the quality of this review / meta-analysis even more: Title / Abstract Please clarify to the reader whether this is a narrative, systematic review or even a meta-analysis. Also add type of research to keywords (ie systematic review, meta-analysis if applicable) Introduction Is far too long. This is being submitted to a psychiatry journal and thus most readers will be somewhat aware of, for instance, what is being summarized under "1.1 Neurology and Psychiatry". Method section This really needs to be more transparent. Did you use Boolean terms in your search? Did your searches differ between the 2 different literature databases? Remember a review ought to be reproducible. Possible, a table / figure might make the necessary elaboration in this section easier? Results This section is lacking in statistical clarity. Now that it is clear that no meta-analysis was carried out (due to the heterogeneity of the outcomes which btw should be stated in the method section) at least p-values ought to be provided; either in the text or even better to be added to Table 1. An assessment of the methodological quality of included studies is lacking. This, however, is deemed necessary by many



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

regarding overviews or reviews published in the medical literature. Please provide such an assessment - for instance, the simple Jadad score, Chalmers score etc). Discussion The discussion needs to represent an overall summary of the included studies according to their methodological quality and should be discussed in the light of such assessment.