

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 67990

Title: Effects of antiseizure medications on alternative psychosis and strategies for their application

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02608938

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-27 14:45

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-04 11:58

Review time: 7 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, Authors systematically reviewed a very clinic relevant psychosis, force normalization or alternative psychosis during treatment of epilepsy patients. This manuscript is well organized from NP history, epidemiology, pathogenesis, clinical features, treatment, and prognosis. Authors specifically strengthen clinical features and treatment to benefit clinicians and thus is timely important to be published. I have only a few comments in improving writing listed below. 1. Please avoid using a long sentence composed of multiple subsentences. It can be either difficult for readers to access or confusion/misleading. For examples, the 2nd sentence in the abstract. 2.

Abbreviation is normally used for a term that is used at least three times. Alternative psychosis is used only once and thus its abbreviation of AP should not be used. 3.

Careful editing to correct grammar errors should be conducted. For example, The 2nd sentence in the introduction should contain “has been significantly improved” instead of “has significantly improved”. 4. Use appropriate terms. For examples, in the abstract, “... factors related to FN.” should be “... factors causing FN.” Contradictory or controversial seems not an appropriate term since they mean either mutually opposite or inconsistent. Here, FN is a case in which the improvement of treated epilepsy patients becomes developing a new or alternative psychosis. So, the term of alternative psychosis should be more meaningful. I suggest to delete contradictory phenomenon and not to use controversial. In the 3rd paragraph of pathogenesis of FN, what does “excision sites” mean?