

[Review Form3](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3937
Title of the Manuscript:	Pathogenic Factors of Tic Disorders in Children: Biological, Psychological and Social Factors
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>
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.	The manuscript has followed the systematic academic processes from the objectives, investigation and findings. The manuscript investigated factors that might have contributed to the situation such as genotype and phenotype. The manuscript considered biopsychosocial aspects of the childhood tic disorders, making it incredibly important for the scientific use.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of manuscript is good as it is.	
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.	The abstract of the article is incredibly instrumental the way its flows to the end, however the words in the abstract are 195 which are less because the ideal abstract takes 300 words. Hence I recommend for the scholar to increase the words in the abstract to 300 words to meet the standard.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The flow of the manuscript is correct, however, the reference materials are 44, yet the recommended number of the reference materials is between 25-40. On the same note, the scholar has widely cited number of reference materials with the names and et al, which shouldn't have been the case, because references are made with numbers only.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference materials are recent, but they are more than required because they are over 40. The scholar is advised to remove at least 4 references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English is standard.	
Optional/General comments	The general comment for the manuscript is that the article is fairly good. However the abstract size is narrower and so limited than required. There is also wide spread of the citations with names which is opposed to the journal writing guidelines, and moreover the size of the manuscript is less than 25 pages which is the prescribed standard. The scholar therefore needs to work on the ways to increase the size of the abstract to 300 words, and increase the size of the article to at least 25 pages, and reduce the size of references to at least 40 maximum.	

[Review Form3](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abraham Ngor Achiek
Department, University & Country	Texila American University, South Sudan