

[Review Form3](#)

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Book Name:               | <a href="#">Disease and Health: Research Developments</a> |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_BPR_3935   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessment Scale for Tic Disorders in Children            |
| Type of the Article      | Book chapter  |

**PART 1: 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> |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b> | The manuscript has importance to the scientific community as it directly deals with the health and wellbeing of a distinct patient population, those who have Tic disorders. Any scientific inquiry or study of the clinical manifestations, diagnosis or treatment of the disorder has high scientific utility. The current manuscript provides some information about various assessment methods for Tic Disorders; however, its contribution to the scientific knowledge on TDC is limited as it only summarizes/describes aspects of the assessment techniques. The manuscript does not summarize research/clinical data or results related to the tools nor does it evaluate the tools in any way. |   |
| <b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>   | The title of the manuscript 'Assessment Scale for Tic Disorders in Children' seems incomplete as it suggests the manuscript is related to scale development. Since the article is more of a review, indicating the same on the title as 'Review of assessment scales for Tic Disorders in Children' could be a better title.  |   |
| <b>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.</b>      | The abstract is comprehensive; however, it is not fully indicative of the nature of the article. The abstract makes it seem like the article is a systematic review of articles. However, the manuscript itself is only a simple descriptive review of the characteristics of the tools, and not a systematic review. The abstract can be modified to better represent the kind of article it is. Instead of only talking about the YGTSS instrument, the utility of MOVES, TSSL, PTQ and assessment of functional impairments can also be mentioned.   |   |
| <b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>  | The manuscript has some scientific utility and it follows a logical scientific method. However, the manuscript can be best described as a 'Descriptive review' as it only summarizes characteristics and details of the various tools rather than discuss research evidence or evaluate utility. Although the abstract makes it seem like a systematic review, there is no apparent Methodology that has been detailed in the main text. The other sections roughly follow a scientific design, but the overall utility is low.   |   |
| <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b><br>=                         | The references have been compiled decently and most of them are recent. Most of the reference entry relates to the topic in hand and in text citations have also been put adequately. There are few errors in the formatting of a number of the bibliography entries. But overall, the references seem to be sufficient for the nature of the manuscript.   |   |

**Review Form3**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b> | The English language used in the article is suitable and of good quality. There are hardly any typos or errors related to use of English language in the manuscript.  |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Abbreviation systems have to be checked for consistency. There are too many abbreviated and related terms like TDC, TTD, CTD, TS, etc. and the use of the abbreviations make the main text confusing at few places. Especially in heading 2.1, when the terms are put as sub headings, it is important to elaborate on the full term.</li><li>• Heading 2.2 'Evaluation criteria for therapeutic effects of TDC' seems completely out of place as the text before and after are dealing with aspects of diagnosis only.</li><li>• A 'Discussion' section is completely missing. The tools have been described in detail; however, there is a need of an evaluative aspect for the article to be meaningful.</li><li>• The 'Conclusion' section is simply a repetition of few earlier parts and it fails to sum up the main points or provide some directions with related to implications or future research.</li></ul> |  |

**PART 2:**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>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)</b> |
| <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:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Name:</b>                                | Prakat Karki                            |
| <b>Department, University &amp; Country</b> | CHRIST (Deemed to be) University, India |