

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 25230

Title: Association between recognizing dementia as a mental illness and dementia knowledge among elderly Chinese Americans

Reviewer's code: 02446410

Reviewer's country: Romania

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-04 11:16

Date reviewed: 2016-03-13 15:32

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input 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

GENERAL COMMENTS The work is interesting and it has a significant degree of originality since it focuses on dementia as a mental illness among elderly Chinese Americans, which represents a rapidly growing population in the US. The main limitation is related with the number of participants on which the study is based. This is only 316, and under such conditions, some conclusions might be not supported by the reality. Nevertheless, the limitations of this study were properly identified by the authors, so in my opinion the work might be appropriate for publication after performing some corrections. **SPECIFIC COMMENTS** 1)Is the overall structure of the manuscript complete? A complete manuscript will contain title, abstract, key words, introduction, materials, methods, experimental procedure, results, discussion, conclusion, acknowledgements, and references. The acknowledgement is missing and some more references would be beneficial. 2) What is the scientific question proposed in the manuscript? This should be clearly presented in the Introduction section, along with the pertinent background, rationale, aim, major findings and potential significance of the study. Collectively, this information should inform whether the

manuscript would be interesting enough to warrant readers' attention? The manuscript is of interest and the scientific question is clearly presented. 3) Which special (unique, innovative and/or timely, appropriate) methods and techniques are adopted in the manuscript? This should be clearly presented in the Methods section. In addition, does the manuscript provide adequate details of methods (including experimental design, subjects or materials, data collection methods, and statistical methods) to allow a reader to repeat the research? The method is clearly presented in the manuscript. Of course, this is not unique, but it can be considered innovative. 4) Is the source of the data that is presented reliable? This will be indicated by the information presented in the Results section. The information in the results section will also indicate the academic significance of the main findings (including figure and tables). The source of data is reliable, the problem is related to the number of subjects investigated which is rather limited. There is no figure in the work, may be a graphical illustration would be beneficial and also the existing Table should be redesigned. 5) What are the results obtained from the data that is presented in the manuscript? This information will make up the Discussion section. It will also answer the questions of whether the results answered the proposed scientific question, achieved the aim of the study, or confirmed or rejected the hypothesis proposed in the manuscript. In general the conclusions and the discussions are supported by the results. 6) What are the conclusions of the manuscript? These should be clearly presented in the Conclusion section. In addition, the section should present the contributions of the conclusions to the field and the weaknesses of the study, and provide future research directions. The conclusions are clear enough. 7) Does the manuscript cite all important, relevant and timely references? Some new references might be included in the work. 8) Is there any indication of academic misconduct in the manuscript? Not visible to me. 9) Does the manuscript conform to the academic rules and norms and include a human and animal rights statement, institutional review board statement, informed consent statement, clinical trial registration statement, institutional animal care and use committee statement, animal care and use statement, biostatistics statement, and conflict-of-interest statement? Yes. 10) Does the manuscript describe any important new methods, problems in or directions of research? The problem targeted seems to be really important. 11) Does this manuscript contribute to understanding the pathog

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 25230

Title: Association between recognizing dementia as a mental illness and dementia knowledge among elderly Chinese Americans

Reviewer's code: 00202286

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-04 11:16

Date reviewed: 2016-04-05 05:37

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"/> 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

This paper is about a study focused on the association between recognizing dementia as mental illness and dementia knowledge in Chinese Americans. The authors report that about one out of four older Chinese Americans recognized dementia as a form of mental illness, while the majority did not. However, when dementia is recognized as a mental illness, such perception is associated with a higher level of baseline dementia understanding. The study has been correctly done. The number of subjects included in the study as well as the statistical tests appear adequate. The authors consider the pitfalls and limitations of the study in the Discussion section. The conclusions of the study are sound. There are very few typos.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 25230

Title: Association between recognizing dementia as a mental illness and dementia knowledge among elderly Chinese Americans

Reviewer's code: 02158063

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-04 11:16

Date reviewed: 2016-04-07 12:29

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 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 study investigated how elderly Chinese American percept dementia, and surprisingly more than expected population are having bias and ignorance on dementia. It also suggested the potential of improving older Chinese Americans dementia literacy by increasing awareness of its mental illness origin. This is an interesting study however several limitations to be clarified. 1. I wonder it is reasonable to make groups based on only one question, 'Is Dementia a chronic mental illness?' Three have been additional information when make groups. 2. It is straightforward that someone with poor knowledge would have bias and someone with knowledge would have understanding. The logic is supposed that having little knowledge on dementia would lead to have bias on dementia, not people with bias have little knowledge. Still the logic seems to be a kind of circular reasoning. Further it would be better if the authors could show people with bias may have less concern or interest in dementia (such as attending seminar or counseling intention). However the participated people are composed be people who attended the dementia seminar, that means they have interest in dement, there should be underestimation of the bias. 3. Personally, I am curious how the people who do not



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>

think dementia as a chronic mental illness think or describe about dementia?