Archives of Neuroscience
Volume 11 · Issue 3 · e145454

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Two-Year Follow-up Outcomes of Non-lesional Epilepsy Surgery in Iran

Shakila Meshkat, Vajiheh Aghamollaii, Atefeh Behkar, Arshia Zardoui, Mojtaba Shahbazi, Abbas Tafakhori

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
27 Jan 2024	12 Apr 2024	29 Apr 2024	10.5812/ans-145454

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

3 comments · 30 Mar 2024 – 7 Apr 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 30 Mar 2024

Dear Authors,
I have carefully reviewed your research article titled "Two-year follow-up outcomes of non-lesional epilepsy surgery in Iran" published in the Archives of Neuroscience. Your study on the surgical outcomes in individuals with drug-resistant epilepsy who underwent surgery despite having non-lesional MRI findings is insightful. However, I would like to suggest some revisions to enhance the clarity and impact of your work.
Introduction and Objectives:
Provide a more concise and focused introduction to clearly outline the significance of the study and the specific objectives being addressed.
Methods:
Clarify the methodology section by detailing the criteria used for patient selection, surgical procedures, and postoperative evaluations.
Include more information on the decision-making process for surgery and the rationale behind the division of patients into different surgical groups.
Results:
Present the patient characteristics and outcomes in a more structured format for easier interpretation.
Provide a detailed analysis of the statistical methods used and the significance of the results obtained.
Discussion and Conclusions:
Expand on the implications of your findings for clinical practice and future research.
Discuss the limitations of the study and potential areas for further investigation.
Figures and Tables:
Ensure that all figures and tables are clearly labeled and referenced in the text for better understanding.
Language and Formatting:
Check for any grammatical errors, inconsistencies, or redundancies in the manuscript.
Ensure that the manuscript adheres to the journal's formatting guidelines for submission.
Overall, your study contributes valuable insights into the benefits of epilepsy surgery in non-lesional drug-resistant epilepsy patients. By addressing these revisions, your article will be more impactful and accessible to the scientific community.
Thank you for your dedication to this research, and I look forward to seeing the revised version of your manuscript.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 7 Apr 2024

Dear EIC,
The manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the literature on epilepsy surgery outcomes in non-lesional patients. With some revisions to improve clarity, address minor errors as mentioned by reviewers, and provide additional context, the manuscript could make a significant impact in the field.
Also, minor changes should be made in the abstract:
The study design should be mentioned in the first line of the methods section of the ABSTRACT.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 7 Apr 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting the article. It needs some revision. Please revise it based on the reviewers' and AE's comments.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:

Hello and respect for author,

This paper presents an interesting study examining [brief description of the research]. The authors have clearly put in a lot of work collecting and analyzing their data. However, there are some areas that need improvement before publication.

kind regards

Response: Dear Reviewer thank you for taking the time and reviewing our manuscript. We have addressed the minor revisions suggested by reviewers.

Reviewer 2:

Dear Authors,

I have carefully reviewed your research article titled "Two-year follow-up outcomes of non-lesional epilepsy surgery in Iran" published in the Archives of Neuroscience. Your study on the surgical outcomes in individuals with drug-resistant epilepsy who underwent surgery despite having non-lesional MRI findings is insightful. However, I would like to suggest some revisions to enhance the clarity and impact of your work.

Introduction and Objectives:

Provide a more concise and focused introduction to clearly outline the significance of the study and the specific objectives being addressed.

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment. We appreciate your feedback on the need for conciseness and focus. Based on your suggestion, we revised the introduction to provide a more streamlined and focused overview of the study's significance and specific objectives.

Methods:

Clarify the methodology section by detailing the criteria used for patient selection, surgical procedures, and postoperative evaluations.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We have clarified the inclusion criteria and made other necessary revisions accordingly.

Include more information on the decision-making process for surgery and the rationale behind the division of patients into different surgical groups.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We want to mention that this study involved an observational analysis of non-lesional epilepsy cases that underwent surgery at our center. The decision-making process for surgery was carried out by a multidisciplinary team comprising neurologists, neurosurgeons, and

neuroradiologists. This decision was based on comprehensive assessments including clinical evaluations, neuroimaging studies, and 24-hour video EEG findings and this is stated in the manuscript.

Results:

Present the patient characteristics and outcomes in a more structured format for easier interpretation.

Provide a detailed analysis of the statistical methods used and the significance of the results obtained.

Response: Thank you for your comment we made the necessary revisions.

Discussion and Conclusions:

Expand on the implications of your findings for clinical practice and future research.

Discuss the limitations of the study and potential areas for further investigation.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We made necessary revisions and discussed the potential areas for further studies.

Figures and Tables:

Ensure that all figures and tables are clearly labeled and referenced in the text for better understanding.

Response: Thank you for your feedback. We have ensured that all figures and tables are clearly labeled and appropriately referenced in the text.

Language and Formatting:

Check for any grammatical errors, inconsistencies, or redundancies in the manuscript.

Ensure that the manuscript adheres to the journal's formatting guidelines for submission.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript to address grammatical errors, inconsistencies, and redundancies. Additionally, we have carefully revised the manuscript to align with the formatting guidelines specified by the journal.

Overall, your study contributes valuable insights into the benefits of epilepsy surgery in non-lesional drug-resistant epilepsy patients. By addressing these revisions, your article will be more impactful and accessible to the scientific community.

Thank you for your dedication to this research, and I look forward to seeing the revised version of your manuscript.

Response: We appreciate you reviewing our manuscript. Your suggestions have greatly improved our manuscript.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear EIC,

The manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the literature on epilepsy surgery outcomes in non-lesional patients. With some revisions to improve clarity, address minor errors as mentioned by reviewers, and provide additional context, the manuscript could make a significant impact in the field.

Also minor changes should be done in abstract:

Study design should be mentioned in first line of method section of ABSTRACT

Response: Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript. We have addressed the minor revisions suggested by the reviewers, including adding the study type to the abstract as you requested. We hope these changes make the manuscript suitable for publication and meet your expectations.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 15 Apr 2024 – 29 Apr 2024

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 15 Apr 2024

Thank you for mentioning all the comments.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 29 Apr 2024

Dear EIC,
I reviewed the manuscript again. The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated.
The authors have addressed all comments.
Thank you

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 29 Apr 2024

Dear Author,
Your revisions have significantly improved the article, and it is now deemed acceptable for publication.
Congratulations on your hard work and dedication to enhancing the quality of your work.