

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Pediatric Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJPR_114929</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Clinical analysis of TIC syndrome: About 60 cases</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Tourette disorder affecting up to 0.5-1 percent of the world population itself is one of the major challenges that usually will face by the researchers to get the samples for this type of rare problems. But still, a study related with the particular rare condition is scientifically important to create awareness about its alternative treatment availability.</p> <p>No, the title is not giving any clear idea about the article meant for. The title can be modified as "A comparative study to find the impact of traditional Chinese medicine, massage application and its combination effect on TIC disorder among children....."</p> <p>No, the article is lacking in many major areas of a research process.</p> <p>The structure of manuscript is not appropriate and the subsections are not sufficient in the manuscript as expected as per the standard. If the study was conducted in a proper manner, there is a possibility of being the manuscript scientifically correct.</p> <p>Could find the insufficient reference related with the research methodology aspects.</p> <p>Apart from the above points mentioned, I just want to mention few more points regarding the article where it is lacking for your kind notice:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective for this study is not formulated as per the need of the study mentioned. Here each independent variable needs to be mentioned for pre-test (pre-intervention), post-test (post -intervention) or effectiveness, comparison, correlation and association. Each activity has its on purpose.</li> <li>Methodology part is lacking with the design (not mentioned anywhere else in the study). Should go with a <b>Factorial Design</b> since in the study it is mentioned three independent variables with three groups. The tool, sampling method used, intervention protocol, a detailed data collection procedure etc are missing.</li> <li>Analysis needs to be done as per the objective. Especially 3-way Anova or 3-factor Anova should apply in the analysis to test for the influence and effect of the three variables on the outcome of (one dependent variable) research.</li> <li>Result needs to arrange based on the objectives.</li> <li>Discussion should concentrate on the current research findings and how it is related with the other supportive studies published. Note: don't use the book literature of the dependent variable in the discussion part (can keep it in the review of literature).</li> <li>It is important to be mentioned the implications of the study in the different areas of study domain and how the study result will create its impact on the society.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Regret to say that this study can not be accepted because of the major drawback in the study from the title to the discussion part.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Smitha Madhavan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lincoln University College, Malaysia</b>