

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 17421

Title: Motor abilities of children and adolescents with a psychiatric condition: A systematic literature review

Reviewer's code: 00485141

Reviewer's country: Finland

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-06 17:01

Date reviewed: 2015-03-17 12:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a systematic review on Motor abilities of children and adolescents with a psychiatric condition. 1) The title and abstract are in general good. In the abstract, a more specific conclusion could be presented. Which conditions especially had high prevalence of impairments? 2) The included conditions were autism spectrum disorders, ADHD, disruptive behavior disorders and depression, why these disorders were selected? How prevalent are these disorders in these age groups? 3) Authors state that a previous focus has looked for childhood gross motor function, but now the authors look also later motor functioning. Were there differences in findings on children when compared to adolescents? 4) Limitations section should be added to discussion. What were possible biases in original studies and what in the review? See e.g. MOOSE guidelines (Stroup et al. JAMA 2000;283:2008-12) for guidelines. Different instrument may measure different things etc. 5) The flow chart is useful, it could be edited to more standard format the arrows for exclusions should leave after the boxes not from boxes. If possible reasons for exclusions of the 64 papers should be presented. Number of articles excluded also in the first phase should be in the corresponding box. 6) In the



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

depression paragraph, authors mention the one paper by Emck. Did they study depression or only any emotional disorder? If not specifically depression this should be mentioned already in methods. If the paper studied only any emotional disorder this paper did not fulfil the current inclusion criteria for the review? 7) The table in the appendix is very useful. Number of people in the control group should be also presented. 8) Did the reviewed articles include any longitudinal studies on the topic? 9) The excluded studies, e.g. those on motor development, should be also discussed briefly. Are the current results in line of those studies? In all, the paper gives good overview about the topic. The topic is interesting and well worth a review.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 17421

Title: Motor abilities of children and adolescents with a psychiatric condition: A systematic literature review

Reviewer's code: 02445209

Reviewer's country: Czech Repoublic

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-06 17:01

Date reviewed: 2015-03-18 18:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, your manuscript is very comprehensive and sophisticated. I only think that "Another 27 studies" (page 2) or "Another seven..." (page 8) is incorrect, "Other 27 studies" or "Other seven..." is better. Similar mistakes are on page 15 (Another 15 studies, Another three studies...). Discussion - it should start with "The aim". The reviewer

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS manuscript NO: 17421

Title: Motor abilities of children and adolescents with a psychiatric condition: A systematic literature review

Reviewer's code: 02445261

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-06 17:01

Date reviewed: 2015-03-16 07:02

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a comprehensive systematic review aimed to summarize the current literature about the motor abilities of children and adolescents suffering from a common psychiatric condition. In summary, the authors found that children and adolescents with ADHD or ASD are at risk for impairment in motor abilities and impairment in motor abilities is common in these child psychiatric disorders. They also stated that evidence regarding the motor abilities of children and adolescents with DBD or Depression is quite lacking. The paper is generally well-written, the authors may find as follows my main comments/ suggestions. First, the authors should specify the rationale underlying the choice throughout the main text to summarize the most relevant research regarding the motor abilities of only four common pediatric psychiatric disorders (specifically, ASD, ADHD, DBD and Depression). Also, throughout the Introduction section, when they stated that an increased risk of affective disorders such as anxiety and depression has been reported in children and adolescents with motor difficulties, and the association of motor impairment with these conditions seems to have a poor prognostic outcome, I also suggest to specify whether and how this type of association may

increase the risk of suicide as one of the possible poor outcomes in children and adolescents. Suicide may be considered in many countries as the second leading cause of mortality among adolescents, therefore it may be very useful for the general readership to clarify the importance of this association in affecting suicide risk. Within the same section, when the authors stated that early detection is a prerequisite for early intervention and may lead to the prevention of secondary adverse outcomes of motor impairment, what they exactly mean for “secondary adverse outcomes of motor impairment”? Here, more details and explanations are needed. Throughout the Methods section, what the authors intended with “ERIC databases”? These terms should be extensively reported, before using abbreviations. Here, what was the contribution of all the authors in selecting the more relevant studies about the main topic, reviewing that the included studies did really meet the inclusion criteria, and writing the main text should be reported throughout the main text. Also, the authors reported that little information is available about the motor abilities of children and adolescents with a depression and they reported the study of Emck and colleagues. They also reported that these authors included children with anxiety disorders and/or depression/dysthymic disorder and no further analyses were conducted to differentiate between these diagnoses. Recently, Serafini et al. (Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2014;23(11):1023-41) conducted a systematic review in which they found more white matter abnormalities in children and adolescents with bipolar disease than in those with unipolar disease. I suggest to cite and discuss this paper throughout the following Discussion section and to specify whether in the authors' opinion some neurodevelopmental changes and early brain changes may be considered as diagnostic-specific in children and adolescents. Within the Discussion section, the authors stated that only three of the included studies specifically addressed the motor abilities of young children under the age of 6. However, some lines ahead they also reported that this kind of research fell beyond the scope of the same manuscript. Why the authors included three studies that did not meet the main aims of the study? The statement should be clarified, alternatively the three mentioned studies should be excluded by the main text. Furthermore, when the authors throughout their recommendations, suggested that for future studies it is required to administer the same motor assessment instrument in order to be able to make comparisons across groups, they should also specify which type of motor assessment instrument