

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Psychiatry

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20852

**Title:** Comprehensive neurocognitive assessment of patients with anorexia nervosa

**Reviewer's code:** 00547906

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-29 11:33

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-04 03:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> 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"/> [ Y] 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"/> 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 an interest research work. I would suggest to include additional discussion on the limitation due to the small sample size of the study. It would have been useful to include more potential confounding factors in the analysis model, but this would not be feasible given the small Ns. Overall I found the research interesting and the manuscript well written.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Psychiatry

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20852

**Title:** Comprehensive neurocognitive assessment of patients with anorexia nervosa

**Reviewer's code:** 02445281

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-29 11:33

**Date reviewed:** 2015-07-30 04:59

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"/> 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

Authors applied the Consensus Cognitive Battery to explore speed of processing, attention/vigilance, working memory, verbal learning, visual learning, reasoning and problem solving, and social cognition in a sample of patients suffering from anorexia nervosa. Care was taken in all ethical aspects. The sample included 26 patients diagnosed as anorectic and compared with 27 control subjects matched for age and IQ. Experimental group received several drug treatments. Diagnosis based on DSM-IV criteria. Authors did not found relevant differences between groups. The rationality of the study is well-documented and experimental design and analysis of data is acceptable. However, non-significant trends usually do not merit a discussion, since there were non-significant differences between groups. The discussion about the sensitivity of the test employed in this study is acceptable and well structured. The treatment of anorexia nervosa is frustrating. In fact, the experimental group, albeit receiving medication sustained the eating disorder. This aspect requires a more detailed description in methods section (for instance, doses and duration of treatments) and a wider discussion, because of the possibility that drug treatment may influence the results of the test, but not the cardinal symptomatology of anorexia nervosa.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Psychiatry

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 20852

**Title:** Comprehensive neurocognitive assessment of patients with anorexia nervosa

**Reviewer's code:** 02445294

**Reviewer's country:** Norway

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-06-29 11:33

**Date reviewed:** 2015-08-19 20:52

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"/> 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

You performed an interesting study and submitted a well written paper. However, I have some concerns. - You wrote that you investigated females with AN and controls matched for age and premorbid intelligence quotient. How have you been able to do so with different sample size for AN and controls? To whom did you match the one more control subject? Based on matched samples I would have expected the application of statistical analysis methods for dependent samples. What was the rationale for the small sample size used? Did you calculate a power analysis before? - Aren't your first and second references a bit outdated (from '95 and '98)? - on p. 12, 2nd paragr. you refer to expectations in a sense of hypotheses. I would suggest that these hypotheses should already be introduced at the end of your introduction combined with giving some rationale for these hypotheses. - On p. 13, 12th row you stated that the patients were "medically stable". Would you please explain what this should mean and how you have been able to draw this conclusion based on the data available (cross-sectional study).