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Reviewer's report:

This article is an interesting topic on treating insomnia. This is a study to test if an optimized clinical formula of acupuncture is able to treat caused by depression.

Comments

The idea is good and the purpose too. There are some things that must be better describe in the protocol, specially in Methods.

a) Language: Sometimes the authors write in “present tense”, sometimes in “past tense”. I would suggest reviewing this.

b) In Methods, the elegibility – inclusion criteria. What will authors use as inclusion criteria for insomnia? They wrote “With insomnia for the No.1 chief compliant”. I suggest they use inclusion criteria of insomnia such as DSMIV.

c) In number 3 inclusion criteria the authors wrote “HAMP”. Did the authors mean “HAMD”? They must check and also write there what is the meaning of it.

d) In number 4 inclusion criteria the authors suggest using PSQI. If the authors want to measure insomnia it would be better to use ISI (insomnia severity index) instead of using PSQI.

e) In number 6 inclusion criteria is: “age from 16 years to 50 years, male or female. However, the exclusion criteria, number 2: “age less than 18 years or more than 65 years”. It is confusing. The authors must revise these information.

f) Subject withdrawal criteria and the management, number 4. “The participants have the adverse reaction related with acupuncture treatment; the investigator is not suitable for the research.” It is not clear. What did the authors mean?

g) What will be the statiscal analyses? They are not described.

1. Will the study design adequately test the hypothesis?
   Yes it is, but methods must be rewritten.

2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses: if not, what is missing?
   Methods must be rewritten as there are several mistakes.

3. Is the planned statistical analysis appropriate?
They are not described.

4. Is the writing acceptable?
Must be revised.