



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 59549

Title: Psychic euosmia among obsessive-compulsive personality disorder patients: A case control study

Reviewer’s code: 05271188

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: United States

Author’s Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-17

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-10-28 12:04

Reviewer performed review: 2020-10-28 13:07

Review time: 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a highly interesting study, with a striking finding regarding the differences of PE in OCPD patients. Two concerns: 1. The determination of PE seems too gross to me. Just one simple question. It is much simpler than the assessment of disgust. Is it a yes/no binary answer? or quantitative scale? How to evaluate those "examples"? More information is needed about the evaluation. Certainly, simplicity can be a very good thing to have. But for the first study, we need to be extra careful about what we measured, for its accuracy and reproducibility. Can the patients be assessed several times to see whether the responses are stable? 2. Sample size is quite small. Only 45 cases. I'd love to see a replicate, just for the PE traits in OCPD vs control. Since the evaluation seems very simple, hope it will not be difficult to add that in.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 59549

Title: Psychic euosmia among obsessive-compulsive personality disorder patients: A case control study

Reviewer’s code: 03604107

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Albania

Author’s Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-17

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-01 14:31

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-07 15:57

Review time: 6 Days and 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I appreciate very much the high level of enthusiasm that authors convey in a very important and well structured paper. However, I think some revisions are needed, in order to come closer to a point. Some parts of the paper are confusing. Notions like 'impurity', 'disgust', 'morality' etc. are principally sociological. Kindly try to summarize your philosophy, more importantly, through quoting relevant sources covering philosophy and psychiatry, if this is your primary wish. Pleasure and disgust and etc. have very important autonomous / vegetative nervous system equivalents: focus on those. Furthermore, if you mention evolutionary hypotheses, and speak about 'survival or death' consider that olfaction among humans scarcely feeds or ensures such a function. It is highly important for mood; partner selection etc. but men usually rely upon new (neo) neural systems to increase survival likeliness. In a few words, speculations will confuse the reader - even if you quote Darwin.