

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27265

**Title:** Agreement and conversion formula between mini-mental state examination and montreal cognitive assessment in an outpatient sample

**Reviewer's code:** 02445222

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-24 13:52

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-27 22:31

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

The paper "Agreement between Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE) and Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) in an Old Age Psychiatry outpatient sample: development of a formula for conversion between the scales" is a quantitative study in elderly outpatients to explore the agreement between the MMSE and MoCA and to develop a "conversion formula" between the two scales. While the topic is of interest, there are some critical points limiting this reviewer's enthusiasm: Major points: 1. The comparison of both scales could be of interest to show differential indications for use or different sensitivity and specificity to detect e.g. MCI; however, the present design seems not appropriate for that purpose (limited size, no gold standard). 2. Why should both instruments be converted into one another? The authors should explain in more detail. 3. The authors claim that that both scales assess "the same construct"; however, neither scale construction and previous findings (as shortly outlined in the Intro of the present paper) nor chance-corrected concordance coefficients in the present study corroborate such a hypothesis. Additional points: 4. Introduction, lines 8-12 (?in addition..."): this sentence needs revision, as in all mentioned "specific populations" (eg. PD) MMSE

and MoCA were used to detect "mild cognitive impairment" (according to Peterson's criteria or not), i.e. patients with an etiologically not further specified MCI syndrome (like [11]) were studied. 5. Introduction, 2nd paragraph: why "mild cognitive decline" (MCI should be consistently used). 6. Materials and methods, Procedures: the authors should comment on why the two short tests were administered with up to "3 hours time gap". 7. Same paragraph: "The tests were administered with no particular order". The authors should clarify (cf Abstract): random order or not? If not, possible order effects have to be discussed. 8. Results, Table 2; MMSE/MoCA scores for the different diagnostic groups should be reported. 9. Results; the calculation basis of z scores is unclear and needs explanation and "introduction" (Methods) 10. Figure 2: the correlation/fit of MMSE and MoCA scores seems to be clearly dependent on the range (high correlation/linear fit in the upper range); why is a cubic but not a quadratic approximation shown? This point is also relevant for the Discussion (p.9) 11. Discussion, p.10, 2nd paragraph: the present sample limits generalization, to apply the "conversion rule" to other studies ("meta-analyses") should be recommended more cautiously.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27265

**Title:** Agreement and conversion formula between mini-mental state examination and montreal cognitive assessment in an outpatient sample

**Reviewer's code:** 02445209

**Reviewer's country:** Czech Republic

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-24 13:52

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-14 13:12

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

I do not have any negative comments on your manuscript, I like it.