

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 27215

Title: Comparative effectiveness of quetiapine and haloperidol in delirium: A single blind randomized controlled study

Reviewer's code: 02445281

Reviewer's country: Mexico

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-05-19 08:44

Date reviewed: 2016-06-08 03:23

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"/> No	<input 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

Authors compared the efficacy of haloperidol against quetiapine in a small sample of patients suffering from delirium. Authors used a blind, randomized experimental design, and conclude that there are not significant differences between treatments. This is a very nice-negative study. The manuscript is very well written, the ethical items well covered, the selection of the sample attended very well the criteria of inclusion and exclusion of patients, the statistical analysis is correct, results are clearly expressed and discussed. Results support similar experiences and may be useful for clinical approaches in the management of delirium.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 27215

Title: Comparative effectiveness of quetiapine and haloperidol in delirium: A single blind randomized controlled study

Reviewer's code: 02445225

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-05-19 08:44

Date reviewed: 2016-06-11 23:55

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 is an interesting randomized controlled trial comparing haloperidol and quetiapine in delirium not related to substance withdrawal. The study has been adequately performed and is well presented. A few suggestions: a) In table 1 it is redundant to present the data of the whole group. b) Table 2 may be redundant altogether. c) it is not designated whether the study was intended to show superiority or non-inferiority c) There is no calculation of power and no discussion of power issues. Actually an $n < 50$ (depending on the type of hypothesis) per study arm may result in insufficient power to detect differences with a medium effect size. d) The study does not report and discuss side effects e) Since the dose of the respective substance was clinically chosen the relationship between main effect and side effects may be an important outcome.