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I think in the UK, we have strict Scottish sinus guidelines on indications for tonsillectomy and hence I am not clear what criteria was used in these studies. Also there seems to be a mix of pt groups.

1. Well children with acute bacterial tonsillitis who will have fever, adenitis, pharyngitis
2. Unwell children who have viral tonsillitis leading to bac tonsillitis with the the same symptoms above and immature immune systems.

Hence the diagnostic criteria is not robust enough to differentiate these 2 groups hence the variable results.

I am slightly confused by the message of the review. In essence this paper is agreeing with the cochrane reviews by adding in the case reports which are of variable quality. So what? So what do I learn extra from this paper?

1. Surgery outweighs observation regardless of quality of the paper. Hence tonsillectomy benefits even if the pt has only one symptoms.
2. Stricter diagnostic criteria of the syndrome, brings in 2 issues, tonsillitis, and immature / weak immune system hence success of surgery decreases as it tackles only one component, so there is a mix of pts in the cohorts.

Can I suggest a relook at what new message is being delivered, rather than critiquing the cochrane review failings, but yet agreeing with its outcome. If u can suggest a theory and explanation of the data would be interesting. See above as an option.
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