



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 61184

**Title:** Expert panel’s guideline on cervicogenic headache: the Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP) recommendation

**Reviewer’s code:** 02608938

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** United States

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-12-25 23:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-01-01 19:15

**Review time:** 6 Days and 19 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Authors as pain management experts from different disciplines in multiple centers across the entire country of China performed literature search and analyses on diagnosis and treatment of cervicogenic headache (CEH) in response to the call of the Chinese Association for the Study of Pain in view of the complicated situation handling CEH patients in the country. They took expert consensus voting for the evidence quality and strength and thus finalized 24 recommendations on CEH management in China. This manuscript is well organized and contains critical information for clinician in China as well as in the field worldwide. My specific comments are listed below. 1. Table 1 can be presented by two separate tables instead of (a) and (b) under one table. 2. Evidence and recommendation relevant to patients in China should be discussed. 3. Writing needs to be improved largely in aspects of English grammar, English and scientific term/phrase as well as scientific flow or logic. Help from a native English speaker in the pain field will be ideal. Examples of correct English phrase vs incorrect one: A group of ... experts vs A ... expert group. Examples of scientific term vs incorrect or non-scientific term: auricular vs ear; pharmacological vs pharmaceutical. Examples of scientific flow in abstract: CEH has been recognized vs ... was ... ; A systematic ... performed, summarized evidence supporting ... ; We hope ... for clinicians and patients making treatment decisions ... . (non-logical statements are underlined here). 4. Appropriate references should be cited to support critical statements. For examples, only one citation was used in section 4 which contains a large amount of information; no citation was given to critical arguments in the first paragraph of section 2.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 61184

**Title:** Expert panel’s guideline on cervicogenic headache: the Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP) recommendation

**Reviewer’s code:** 05383381

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Physiotherapist

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** United States

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-12-26 15:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-01-05 11:54

**Review time:** 9 Days and 20 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I would like to applaud the authors for the consideration of this topic and the need to discuss the best treatment approach for CEH. The manuscript lacks in the introduction some significant depth. Missing the justification on the written statements by lack of proper referencing. Suggest having someone with better knowledge of the grammar of the English language review the article. The recommendations are not supported by the research evidence you provide and this is an issue as this is an evidence based treatment approach and it seems that the expert panel and the research are not supporting each other much. Manuscript needs to include a better way how the modified Delphi process was undertaken. How the journal articles were graded and ranked and by who. There is no conclusion.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 61184

**Title:** Expert panel’s guideline on cervicogenic headache: the Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP) recommendation

**Reviewer’s code:** 03455463

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** China

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-01-12 10:29

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-02-07 07:41

**Review time:** 25 Days and 21 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In this study, Xiao et al summarized evidence supporting the benefits and harms for the management of cervicogenic headache. The recommendations were described in detail, and the reviewer learned a lot from this article. This manuscript contains important information for clinician. After a minor editing, this manuscript should be published.



**RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 61184

**Title:** Expert panel’s guideline on cervicogenic headache: the Chinese Association for the Study of Pain (CASP) recommendation

**Reviewer’s code:** 05383381

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Physiotherapist

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** United States

**Author’s Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-11-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Han Zhang (Part-Time Editor)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-02-27 12:03

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-02-28 13:04

**Review time:** 1 Day and 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**



**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

Review feedback Overall comment: This revision would have benefitted from a rationale why the panel opinion regarding strength of the recommendation is not the same as the evidence provided with the literature. This remains an issue as the guidelines for CGH are moving to a evidence based approach. Lines refers to continues line numbering in document Introduction Line 118 needs reference Line 121 needs reference Line 124 needs reference Anatomy and pathophysiology Line 157 needs reference Line 160-1: needs reference Line 164 needs reference Clinical features This section is not offering true clinical features a clinician should look for please be clearer now you only have trigger points. Not clear how this typical patient will present. Line 179 please clarify if this is active and or passive motion Management Please describe how the CASP selected the experts and what was this based on? Are they equally representing the disciplines to answer your posed questions based on professional expertise? Scope determination section is not aligned well. Might serve the reader better to number them Line 210: this is a statement sentence and not a question. Please revise Recommendation making Line 241: panel made recommendations (change from make) Line 245-6 needs to be explained more. Recommendations: Line 261-267: needs references Line 270-273 needs references Line 276-277: needs references Line 280-283: needs references Minimal invasive Interventional management: Line 317. Consider placing the word: However before Three Line 320-321 needs reference Line 326-328 needs reference Line 331-332 needs reference TCM Line 363: change researches to research and reference Line 366: if you make this statement you have to substantiate this: why should patients across the world cautiously use TCM? Psychological therapy Line 370-371: needs refences Health education: Line 380-382. Needs more explanation and needs references Tables are great addition to the paper and explain well. Some headings in blue and last one is not. Be consistent