

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 18329

Title: Early psychological interventions for psychosis

Reviewer's code: 00551176

Reviewer's country: Hungary

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2015-04-21 08:47

Date reviewed: 2015-04-22 22:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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

It is a well-written concise review on the possible role of psychological interventions in psychosis.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 18329

Title: Early psychological interventions for psychosis

Reviewer's code: 00723721

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2015-04-21 08:47

Date reviewed: 2015-06-30 18:49

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 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"/> 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		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is a succinct review of an interesting issue, not enough studied to date. My impression of the quality of the review is good. However, I think that there are some points which should be revised and reconsidered. - The authors do not state which type of review they have develop. I guess that it was a non-systematic review, but this should be clearly stated (narrative review). - Sentence "In a review by Barlati et al. (2013), we found differing results that showed the efficacy of Cognitive Remediation Therapy (CRT) in the early course of psychosis". I did not understand the meaning of 'differing' here, and still did not when I read the original article. I guess that the authors meant "several". Additionally, it would be preferable to use the form "the authors found...". - Sentence "In summary, psychological therapies in the early stages of the illness are useful for..." I strongly disagree with the use of such categorical conclusion ("...are useful for...") especially when several of the aspects rely on just one study. Among others, suicide: it relies on one study whose outcome was suicidal ideation, not suicide, nor suicidal attempts. I think that the authors should change the categorical expression and use a cautious one. For example, "Although the literature on psychological therapies in the early stages of the illness is still scarce, the results suggest

that they could be beneficial in several domains, such as..." - Sentence "Previously, Marshall et al. (2011) found that there was inconclusive evidence that interventions could help in the prodromal phase". In order to preserve a more logical order, I think that this sentence should be located previous to " Two meta-analyses have been performed..." and point out the discrepancy between the existing systematic reviews. - Entire paragraph beginning with: Other studies analyzing the efficacy of CRT... I cannot see the point of including this study. Whereas the authors are focusing in the Psychological interventions as early strategies to prevent psychosis, this study deals with the different effectiveness of a cognitive intervention to improve cognition, and how it was more effective in those with prodromal patients, but this is not the discussed issue. - Sentence: "However, the meta-analyses noted above^{23,24} point up...". English is not my native language, but I guess that the authors wanted to say "points up" or "pointed up". - Sentence: "Effective psychological interventions for early stages are needed due to the importance early intervention in reducing chronicity". This is a linguistic remark. I guess that the correct expression is "...to the importance of early intervention..." - Sentence: "Several advantages arise in the use of psychological therapies for people with psychosis in several phases of the illness, among which is the absence of side effects in contrast to medication". I obviously agree regarding the absence of somatic adverse effects of psychotherapy in psychosis, but it does not mean that it has potentially no negative consequences, that should also be studied. For example, any type of psychotherapy in psychosis which directly or indirectly increases the awareness of illness may constitute a risk factor for suicide in patients with depression or hopelessness. I think that this notion should be pointed out (their potential disadvantages or risks, and if the authors do not find any literature, state that it has not been found. - Finally, from a whole perspective, I miss some more critical discussion from the authors about the described and exposed existing literature, beyond a descriptive approach. A good critical discussion about the existing literature always enriches the quality of a narrative review.