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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The age range is very high. As the pain tolerability also changes with age and other conditions of neuropathy. Such factors should have been taken into consideration.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Notes on the manuscript: Title: Good. Abstract: there is no background in the abstract. The type of study is not mentioned. The results parts is not clear, kindly rewrite, as it doesn't show which group was more effective, only statistical difference (which is not clear to which arm), you should mention the effectiveness of your intervention as compared to the control. note: P value is not the best way to present effectiveness. There is no mention of a trial registry number, please add (registration code: ChiCTR1900022177). Introduction: The first paragraph is out of scope of the topic in question, please omit and change. Also, please add an introductory part about the intervention's background "wrist-ankle acupuncture". "With the change of living habits and diet structure, the incidence of digestive tract diseases, especially the lower digestive tract diseases, have been increasing annually in recent decades. Meanwhile, the incidence of colorectal cancer has been reported to rank the highest in malignant tumors[1], indicating the urgency in the prevention and treatment of lower digestive tract diseases. Various assistant examination methods are available for gastrointestinal diseases currently. Among them, digestive endoscopy has become the preferred in view of its advantages in visibility, intuitiveness and accuracy[2]." Methods: The authors mentioned "Rejection criteria" after "exclusion criteria", it is not clear what they meant by that?>> are these patients excluded after inclusion, and if so, are they counted as attrition? or how the outcome is registered in those patients, kindly clarify. Could the authors kindly clarify why they excluded all patients with prolonged procedure? as they are 10% of the patients, and why they didn't include the early data from the procedure? Results: Most of the results mentioned only in the active intervention groups, and the control group is only mentioned as a comparison with Pvalue only>> it is preferable to mention the indices of both intervention and control group with standard deviation and
confidence interval along with risk ratio or odds ratio. This will be more meaningful display of statistics. Quote from manuscript: "The wake-up time in WAA group was 3.26±0.87 min, which was significantly lower than that in CON group (P<0.05)". Tables and figures: I think a better presentation of the results in "Box plot" would be of benefit in visualizing the effect of the intervention. In first table of baseline data, the authors need to mention all baseline data, they only mentioned few items?, eg history of DM or HTN, previous endoscopy, reason for endoscopy, baseline lab and blood pressure etc. if feasible. Discussion: Some parts of the discussion could be used in introduction as background for the topic. There is some repetition of displaying the results: First scentence "Inter-group comparison indicated that the wake-up time of WAA group was superior to that of CON group, which may be caused by the decrease of total propofol dose during the whole operation, so that the patients could wake up more rapidly from anesthesia." second sentence "It suggests that patients in WAA group have a rapid wake-up from anesthesia. " the authors mentioned "Our study was designed as a clinical observation with certain limitations." >> this is an RCT, so it is not clinical observation, it is an intervention trial, kindly modify.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thank you for your kind response and modifications. Please add the explanation you mentioned for rejection criteria to your manuscript. "Patients were excluded because the operation time was too long. Generally, the operation time was less than 30 minutes, and there were 19 cases of more than 30 minutes. The purpose was to unify the control standards. The rejection criteria is that the cases that have been included in the collection can be counted as attrition. These patients are recorded in the same way as other patients. The early data of the cases are not included because these cases cannot be unified control standards."