

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61260

Title: Editorial for the Special Issue of Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP)

Reviewer's code: 03604107

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Albania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-01

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-31 19:24

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-02 17:24

Review time: 1 Day and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper needs absolutely to be re-written from an English native speaking physician. It is full of errors, awkward expressions, that will make it very hard to read for a global audience, who craves for a good terminology. Kindly re-consider also the structure of the manuscript. You cannot propose guidelines in such a confusing form. There is an overall scale when proposing interventions: from expert opinions / to large-scale, multi-center studies with double blind control procedures. Thus, 'acupotomy', 'internal heated needle' (??), need to be explained and you must as well uphold suggestions with sound data, derived from A-class studies (evidence - based medicine); as well as quoting thoroughly sources that have applied successfully the procedures. 'Human meridians' will be hardly understood from western anesthesiologists: I do not mean you're wrong. You just need to approach the issue globally. The journal is an international, prestigious one; and guidelines must be of a large value, if not universal. Further errors: "multimode analgesia" (multimodal; which modes ?); 'injectio' (injection)...; 'it is hoped".... Other sentences needing re-writing: Analgesics is the first choice in the treatment of pain. How to use drugs safely and effectively, and how to treat chronic pain effectively, need to follow the guidance and suggestions of expert consensus and guidelines. Also, I have rarely seen any paper without references (editorials included): how about quoting important sources?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61260

Title: Editorial for the Special Issue of Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP)

Reviewer's code: 00506214

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-01

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-31 01:37

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-04 18:16

Review time: 4 Days and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This editorial celebrates the growing role of pain therapy in Chinese Medicine by promulgating 10 guidelines and consensus statements. My comments are directed at the organization and conclusion. In stating that there are 10 guidelines and consensus statements, I would then indicate "which are grouped by their relevance to 1) Chronic Pain, 2) Pharmacologic Therapy and 3) Interventional Therapy. The heading "Medicine Therapeutic Aspects is not in bold, so, particularly because there is no indication of 3 sections, it is unclear what this is. "Algology aspects" does not seem like a good section heading. Finally, in the conclusion. This body of work represents a great start by the CASP, but what are the future goals and objectives, long and short term. A few specific sentences about this would be more forward looking.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61260

Title: Editorial for the Special Issue of Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP)

Reviewer's code: 00526025

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-01

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-02 08:27

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-07 06:15

Review time: 4 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

You summarize a guideline and consensus on the diagnosis and treatment of pain that are recommended by the Chinese association for the study of pain. These recommendations are important for pain treatment in China. Your descriptions are not consistent. The introduction says that “the issue contains 10 consensus and guidelines.”

However, the algology aspects say that “the issue contains one guideline and three expert consensus. The body of the manuscript shows one guideline and 9 consensus. WHICH is right? I would recommend that the manuscript be written as follows:

1. Guideline Cervicogenic headache 2. Consensus 1) Diagnosis and treatment of lumbar disc herniation Lumbar disc.... 2) Diagnosis and treatment of myofascial pain syndrome Myofascial pain syndrome refers.... 3) ... Specific comments:

Page1 First paragraph, line 3: What is the subject for “required?” Line 6: I would recommend “various” for “different” pain diseases. Line 9: I would recommend inserting “in” between “and” and “establishing.” Last line of guideline I would recommend “are recommended [to guide] invasive therapies.” Page 3 Line 1: “Injectio” should be “injectio[n].” Line 5: “Surgical-related” should be “surgery”-related or “surgically related.” Page 5 Line 1 of “Ozone treatment”: Treatment “to” pain should be treatment “of” pain. END

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61260

Title: Editorial for the Special Issue of Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP)

Reviewer's code: 03604107

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Albania

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-01

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-20 05:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-20 15:35

Review time: 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you very much for complying with the suggestions. The last (minor) correction:

Do not write or talk about guideline (in singular); but rather guidelines (in plural).
Very rarely there is only a single guideline: there are several (guidelines).

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61260

Title: Editorial for the Special Issue of Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP)

Reviewer's code: 00526025

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-01

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-20 12:54

Reviewer performed review: 2021-02-21 03:53

Review time: 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I am afraid there are too many typographical errors to review. All co-authors should

read through the manuscript before submission.