

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_122412
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical study of 435 children with Tourette syndrome
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The traditional Chinese treatment options are underrepresented and probably underestimated in Western medical community, therefore any well-done study on them brings us new insights about this potentially efficient treatment. Although there are some randomized trials and 2 meta-analysis on the topic of acupuncture in Tourette syndrome (e.g. Zhao et al. 2020, Yu et al. 2016, You et al. 2021 etc.), its use in persons with tics is still limited. More data on traditional Chinese medicine in tic disorders and/or Tourette syndrome will contribute to a better understanding of its mechanisms of action and its popularization in the medical community.</p> <p>However, the prospective studies should be prioritized, what is not the case of the research presented in the manuscript. A good English is absolutely required to clearly formulate the statements. The definitions of "Tourette syndrome" and "tic disorder" should be checked by the authors of manuscript – although the both are a part of a continuum, they are not the same. Using them as synonyms confuses the reader and reduces the trust in the presented results.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Clinical study of 435 children with Tourette syndrome" is a way too general. It doesn't tell the potential reader neither what kind of study was performed, nor about the study itself. I'd suggest to change it into "Acupuncture in Tourette syndrome: a retrospective study on 435 children", or something like this.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>I have some suggestions concerning the abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the objectives the authors state, that they studied the clinical efficacy of a "traditional Chinese medicine paste" for the treatment of the Tourette patients. However, already in Methods there are mentioned 435 patients with tic disorder. Although both (Tourette syndrome and tic disorder) are a part of a continuum, they are not the same. This is confusing. I suggest that the authors consult the definition of Tourette syndrome and of the tic disorder and decide, which disorder was studied. 2. In the Conclusions, they write about a "Chinese plaster" – what is quite confusing again: is it a typing error? Because before there was "paste" and "patch"....Also I would suggest to shortly state in the abstract, what kind of paste/patch/plaster it was, as for a Western reader it is not clear at all (which substance did it contain?) 3. Also in the Methods: "divided into two groups to observe the clinical efficacy of the two groups" - this should definitely be reformulated. 4. In the Results: adding the percentages of the patients in whom the treatment was effective and of those, in whom it wasn't (not just the number) would simplify the comparison for the reader. "Significantly higher" – here would be useful a "p-value". 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections are appropriate.</p> <p>However, in my opinion, the authors should reduce the Introduction and focus in it mostly on how disabling Tourette syndrome is and describe more about the existent studies on Chinese traditional medicine in tics, as well as present the importance and novelty of their research in comparison with the existent one (is it a study that shows some new aspects of the traditional Chinese medicine? Is it a confirmation study? Why was it needed? What kind of paste/patch (?) was used and why there is mentioned acupuncture? Is this the same? It is all unclear.</p> <p>The Research Methods chapter is well-structured. However, I miss some information (I will describe it in the part concerning the scientific correctness of the study).</p> <p>The Research results are a way too short (and some other objections I describe below).</p> <p>The Discussion should focus on results of the study, not just present some random facts about Tourette syndrome.</p> <p>The short form for the "Traditional Chinese medicine" – TCM – should be defined somewhere in the text before being used. Here the authors describe the auricular point striking – this should be moved to</p>	

Review Form 3

	the Methods and described much more comprehensive and detailed.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>I miss some more concrete facts about the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What kind of hospital it was - a movement disorder clinic, a general pediatric clinic, a neurological clinic? Were these outpatients or admitted patients? - Were these consecutive patients or were they selected based on some criteria? - Were the patients from the control group healthy or did they had any other diseases? - What the authors mean by "tic strips"? Which diagnostic criteria did they use to diagnose Tourette syndrome and/or tics? - Why such a big discordance between the placebo and tic group concerning the number of patients (350 vs 50?) - Did they determine severity of tics (Which scales were used for it? Or was it just a subjective assessment of the patients? Were there some video-recordings with ratings?) - How many sessions were done? What was concretely done, which patches, where, how were the points selected, how much time, which side effects occurred (if any)? - In the Results section I miss the percentages, as only the numbers are confusing. - As well, the results are confusing in general: what do the authors mean by the "significantly effective"? How did they define the efficacy (and its division in "excellent", "effective" and "ineffective")? Which statistical methods did they use to determine the significance? What was compared? - Which was the role of the placebo group? 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	A short search of the literature in English on Pubmed published during the last 5 years returned a couple of more recent publications on the traditional Chinese medicine in Tourette syndrome.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>No, it isn't. The authors should check the spaces between the points and the beginning of the new phrases. "Tourette" is written with a big "T". They should check the commas, as well (e.g. in "that is, sudden, rapid, repeated" – one doesn't need the comma after "that is").</p> <p>In general, the text should be checked by someone who is proficient in English, as there are many mistakes.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The idea of the study is interesting, however either it is badly presented or was badly performed. I suggest to the authors to critically review the structure of the study and its data, to read some similar studies and to rewrite the manuscript.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Valeria Sajin
Department, University & Country	Germany