



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 17419

Title: Months Backward Test: A review of its use in clinical studies

Reviewer's code: 02445222

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-07 12:35

Date reviewed: 2015-03-09 05:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled "The Months Backward Test: a review of its use in clinical studies" is a straightforward and well-written review dealing with a highly intriguing cognitive test. I have only minor points of recommendation: 1. Abbreviations (throughout the manuscript, incl Abstract; e.g., MCI, MF)- Abbreviations should be written in full when they first occur 2. Reliability (p.10) This section should be reported or critically discussed in more detail, if possible. For a better understanding of this crucial point, the number of patients/subjects of the reliability studies should be included and the statistical parameters of reliability should be reported or discussed according to current standards (preferably, chance-corrected retest or interrater agreement: coefficients kappa, intraclass correlations). 3. Scoring It would be desirable to get an additional suggestion for a more objective, numerical scoring rule comprising time and quality (errors) of patients' answers.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 17419

Title: Months Backward Test: A review of its use in clinical studies

Reviewer’s code: 02445281

Reviewer’s country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-07 12:35

Date reviewed: 2015-03-10 04:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors did a revision about the use and utility of the “Months Backward Test”. It is a complete and nicely written manuscript. They found that this test is a very economical, fast and apparently accurate tool for exploring various cognitive functions at the side of the bed of the patient or in healthy volunteers. I have only a couple of observations. 1. Avoid the use of many abbreviations as possible. It is true that in a hospital is common to refer to many diseases and clinical signs or entities by the short-economic use of a few letters. But for some readers it may be very confuse. 2. It could be nice if the conclusion contains any proposal. It is true that the use of this test is receiving many different ways for evaluation and rating. Do authors have any proposal? For instance they cited an algorithm (Lamar et al., 2002), how frequently and with success is used? Otherwise, the manuscript seems acceptable but excessively descriptive.