

# Review of: "Deep roots of admixture-related cognitive differences in the USA?"

Karthikeyan Vijayakumar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Chosun University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

## Comments on the manuscript:

In this study titled "Deep roots of admixture-related cognitive differences in the USA", the authors pointed out various differences in the cognitive capacity of various races in the USA. The authors have used various statistical analyses to show these differences by using a huge number of data collected for centuries. Finally, the authors show that people with European ancestry have better scores on all the tests when compared to other racial groups. This, indeed, is in line with the inherited disadvantage theory.

After reading this manuscript, I have found there are some revisions that need to be done by the authors. The revisions are mentioned below.

### Major Revisions:

1. The abstract is not well structured. The abstract can be structured in a way so that contains the aim and background of the study, methods implemented, and outcomes of the study.
2. After reading the whole manuscript, it is still not sufficiently clear what the authors are trying to address through this study. Is it just to show the cognitive difference in each ethnicity, or is there an additional research focus? The study, though, points out that inherited disadvantage could be a reason for the lower cognitive scores in other ethnic groups compared with whites but it is not clear what is the hypothesis and aim behind this study. In other words, the authors should revise their section on Research Questions.
3. All the results are represented in tables. It could be better for the readers to understand the study if the data were represented graphically. For instance, the results of the study can be represented graphically to more clearly show the score differences between the ethnic groups.
4. In methods 2.2.2.3 Color or Race, the authors mentioned that they used the term Mulattoes as it was officially designated in the original datasets. My suggestion of the authors is that it is an offensive term in modern times. The authors are recommended to use an alternative term that is not offensive by giving a note saying, "The term Mulattoes will be replaced by a non-offensive term".
5. In some of the places, the authors just talk about the associations and correlations, instead of showing the value in the manuscript. It is difficult for the readers to go back and forth to refer to the table.
6. Similar to the abstract, the authors are recommended to properly structure the discussion part.

Minor Revisions:

1. In the methods section 2.2.2.1 Sex, is it supposed to be 1 for male and 2 for female?
2. Check for typos, as a few words were misspelled.