

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 17206

Title: Influence of gender in the recognition of basic facial expressions: A critical literature review

Reviewer's code: 02446319

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-02-25 20:26

Date reviewed: 2015-04-23 11:58

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 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 checked="" 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"/> No	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I really appreciate your serious effort to collect, arrange and evaluate the data of previously published articles about the influence of gender in the recognition of basic facial expressions. However, I think it can be more meaningful if it contains not only the limits of the studies conducted to date, but also your opinion, plan or method for the future standardized study in discussion part.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 17206

Title: Influence of gender in the recognition of basic facial expressions: A critical literature review

Reviewer's code: 02446677

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-02-25 20:26

Date reviewed: 2015-04-26 20:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input 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

This systematic review deals with a relevant issue such as the influence of gender in the recognition of facial expressions. Authors' main findings are the lack of homogeneity among the studies and their serious methodological flaws. Data are therefore inconclusive and this fact strongly suggests the need for further studies with improved and standardized procedures. The manuscript is easy to read, and results and comments are well exposed throughout the paper. The authors assure that there are no systematic reviews available dealing with evidence produced in this field. This is a strong point of this review but I would suggest they clarify what Fusar-Poli et al's results were in this specific field. Moreover, why other reviews and meta-analyses such as Chaplin & Aldao (2013) or Statucka & Walder (2013) are out of their scope. My only other suggestion would be to specify strengths and caveats of their methodology.