This narrative review provides a broad overview of the magnitude of cognitive dysfunction in bipolar disorder, potential clinical and demographic factors influencing cognition, currently available treatments for cognitive dysfunction in BD, and potential novel treatments. My primary concern is related to the focus of the research question, which is, in my opinion, too broad to be informative at a clinical level or of relevance for the design of future studies. As a result, the discussion section tackles a number of domains but fails to concisely provide a take-home message summarizing primary findings, gaps in the literature and future clinical directions.

I appreciate the fact that a number of questions still needs to be resolved in this field. However, a shorter and more focused review would provide clear and constructive insight into what needs to be addressed in future research. Given the abundance of papers focusing on cognitive functions (e.g. hot/cold domains) a systematic or meta-analytical review of the literature is warranted.

A narrative review like this one would be helpful only if focused on one topic in particular. For instance, either cognitive domains (with more specificity within each domain such as deficits in immediate learning, recall, recognition rather than just verbal memory), or treatment, or moderators of cognition. I would therefore encourage the authors to restructure their manuscript, add a specific focus, provide more recent references, provide numbers (e.g. number of reliable studies using cognitive remediation, major findings) that would support their statements, and keep in mind that their findings need to be specific to be used in a clinical setting, and/or used by a scientific audience interested in designing effectiveness studies.

I would also encourage the authors to provide critical appraisal of the findings. For instance they could add an assessment of the quality of the studies included in this review based on quality checklists, mention limitations of the cognitive instruments, publication bias etc.