

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Methodology*

Manuscript NO: 76054

Title: COVID-19 neuropsychiatric repercussions: Current evidences on the subject

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05628603

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-28

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-27 07:49

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-06 10:06

Review time: 9 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written and structured. It is smooth to read. The experiment described is well designed. The results are displayed and discussed. The contribution of the article represents an advance in the area of knowledge. However, I suggest the following two improvements: a) The state of the art of the problem dealt with should be expanded in the introduction. b) The conclusions should be improved by synthetically indicating what the scientific contribution is and proposing a set of lines of work.