

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 64675

**Title:** Molecular typing of familial temporal lobe epilepsy

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00631867

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Australia

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-28

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-13 02:06

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-18 02:10

**Review time:** 5 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have read the paper and in the abstract alone there are sufficient grammatical and syntactic errors to justify a rewrite. I chose not to criticise the abstract as there were too many issues that arose within the use of the English language. For the paper in general, I make the following comments: The following quotation demands being referenced, "Epilepsy can be classified into focal, generalized, combined generalized and focal, and unknown according to the origin of the seizures." No reference for this statement is offered. The same applies to the following quotation also lifted from the introduction, "Epilepsy affects approximately 50 million people worldwide, among which up to 60~70% of affected individuals have focal epilepsy." The word "However", being the first word from page 2 is superfluous and should be omitted, as is the case very soon thereafter, as per the following quotation, "However, due to the lack of..." This same sentence requires referencing as it is a challenging bold statement and no reference is offered. In the following quotation the words, "In fact" should not appear as if it is not fact then it should not be in the paper and if it is fact then it need not be so stated, "In fact, due to the high rates..." I could criticise every sentence in this submission along similar lines, namely poor syntax, grammatical issues, superfluous language or lack of referencing and will refrain from providing further editorial input, other than to suggest that the author(s) revisit the paper and address these shortcomings. Scientific papers should be in third person, past tense not first person, acknowledging that I am a pedant when it come to such issues. There has been a change in nomenclature such that the following quotation, namely, "prognosis was good with anti-epilepsy drugs" should be modified to read 'anti-seizure medications', rather than "anti-epilepsy drugs". The same applies to the use of "AED" which should now read 'ASM' to denote the change in acceptance of



**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

the abbreviation/acronym. One should avoid the use of commas before conjunctives such as 'and' and 'but'. When using acronyms, such as MRI, it should be in full the first time it is used although many of the acronyms used by these authors have been adopted as common jargon but they should be encouraged to stick to the rules. As previously stated, I will not discuss language shortcomings further but this is the major flaw of this paper. It offers a good summary of the genetic causes of epilepsy and seizures and is worthy of publication but the failings in language usage detract from the acceptability of the submission. I have marked the survey below but the author(S) need to revisit the paper to address language issues although I believe the paper is informative and, with suitable corrections, should then be accepted for publication.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Psychiatry*

**Manuscript NO:** 64675

**Title:** Molecular typing of familial temporal lobe epilepsy

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05319907

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBBS

**Professional title:** Research Scientist

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-28

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

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-10 11:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-22 12:56

**Review time:** 12 Days and 1 Hour

<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for allowing me to review this very interesting paper. The authors have explored and explained the research progress of eight recorded forms of focal temporal lobe epilepsies. The manuscript is well-written overall; however, I urge the authors to make a few minor changes as mentioned below.

1. Title. The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript appropriately
2. Abstract. The abstract summarizes the work described in the manuscript. I urge the authors to add a concise sentence explaining the main aim of their narrative review at the end of the abstract.
3. Key words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript- the keyword “inherit” can be removed or replaced with another specific keyword.
4. Background. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status, and significance of the study
5. Methods. Not applicable
6. Results. Not applicable
7. Discussion. The manuscript interprets the review findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. The findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature is stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion is accurate to the paper’s objective and discusses the scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice appropriately. The conclusions are made in accordance with the evidence presented and future directions have also been noted in the article.
8. Illustrations and tables. I suggest adding a table summarizing the genes and the various clinical presentations to give an added completion to the manuscript.
9. Biostatistics. Not applicable
10. Units. Not applicable
11. References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important, and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references?
12. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation.

The manuscript well written, concisely, and coherently organized and presented. The style, language, and grammar accurate and appropriate. The authors have provided a non-native speakers of English editing certificate. 13. Research methods and reporting. The authors have prepared the manuscript appropriately as required for a narrative review. 14. Ethics statements. Not applicable. The authors state no conflict of interest and declared the funding information for the manuscript. Overall, good job! and best of luck!