Archives of Neuroscience
Volume 11 · Issue 4 · e150498

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Comparison of Premature Ejaculation in Men with Focal Epilepsy and Generalized Tonic-Clonic Epilepsy

Masoumeh Otaghi, Seyed Hossein Aghamiri, Amir Adibi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
30 Jun 2024	28 Jul 2024	3 Aug 2024	10.5812/ans-150498

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** Seyyed Ahmad Hosseinzadeh, Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4

Authors' reply to reviewers 5

Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

4 comments · 21 Jul 2024 – 22 Jul 2024

Seyyed Ahmad Hosseinzadeh Reviewer

ACCEPT 21 Jul 2024

The article with identification code 150498 is a comparative research article with a standard structure. The number of samples was appropriate and their distribution between the two research groups was not a problem in terms of statistical data and the analyses carried out. The structure of the discussion and the conclusions related to the comparison of similar articles and studies also seem sufficient and convincing. The number of reviewed references is relatively sufficient, and in general, the recent article does not have any special problems for publication in this journal, and it is approved.

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 22 Jul 2024

Dear Author, Thank you for submitting your manuscript "Comparison of premature ejaculation in men with focal epilepsy and generalized tonic-clonic epilepsy" to Archives of Neuroscience. I have reviewed your manuscript and have the following suggestions for revision: 1. Abstract: - Consider adding a brief background on epilepsy and its potential impact on sexual function to provide context. - The Methods section could be more concise—focus on key aspects of study design, participants, and measures used. - In the Results, report the actual p-value for the comparison of PE scores between groups, rather than just stating it was not significant.
2. Introduction: - Provide more background on epilepsy, including prevalence and impact on quality of life. - Include a clearer rationale for comparing focal vs. generalized epilepsy in terms of PE. - State your specific hypotheses.
3. Methods: - Provide more details on how epilepsy diagnoses were confirmed. - Clarify if any power analysis was done to determine sample size. - Describe any steps taken to control for potential confounding variables.
4. Results: - Consider including a table summarizing key demographic and clinical characteristics by epilepsy type. - Provide effect sizes in addition to p-values where relevant. - A figure visualizing the key PE score comparisons could enhance clarity.
5. Discussion: - Expand on potential mechanisms that may explain your findings. - Address limitations of the study more thoroughly. - Discuss clinical implications and directions for future research more explicitly.
6. General: - Proofread carefully for minor grammatical and spelling errors throughout. - Ensure consistent formatting of numbers, units, and statistical notation. I believe addressing these points will strengthen your manuscript. Please submit your revised version along with a point-by-point response to these suggestions. Thank you for your contribution to Archives of Neuroscience.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 22 Jul 2024

Dear EIC,
I thank the authors and express my appreciation to the researchers. This study was conducted with the aim of comparing premature ejaculation in men with focal epilepsy and generalized tonic-clonic seizure (GTCS). The manuscript is a valuable piece of research. But some revisions are needed. The authors should revise it based on the reviewers' comments.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 22 Jul 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:

Question:

The article with identification code 150498 is a comparative research article with a standard structure. The number of samples was appropriate and their distribution in two research groups was not a problem in terms of statistical data and the analyzes carried out. The structure of the discussion and the conclusions related to the comparison of similar articles and researches also seem sufficient and convincing. The number of reviewed references is relatively sufficient, and in general, the recent article does not have any special problems for publication in this journal, and it is approved

Reply:

Thank you very much for the comments of the respected Reviewer. Thank you very much.

Reviewer2:

Question:

Dear Author, thank you for submitting your manuscript "Comparison of premature ejaculation in men with focal epilepsy and generalized tonic-clonic epilepsy" to Archives of Neuroscience. I have reviewed your manuscript and have the following suggestions for revision: 1. Abstract: - Consider adding a brief background on epilepsy and its potential impact on sexual function to provide context. - The Methods section could be more concise - focus on key aspects of study design, participants, and measures used. - In the Results, report the actual p-value for the comparison of PE scores between groups, rather than just stating it was not significant.

Reply:

Background: Premature ejaculation (PE) is one of the sexual disorders in men, which has a significant prevalence in neurology patients. Epilepsy is one of these diseases in which the prevalence of PE has been reported to be significant.

Objectives: This study was conducted with the aim of comparing premature ejaculation in men with focal epilepsy and generalized tonic-clonic seizure (GTCS).

Methods: In this cross-sectional and observational study, patients with epilepsy were included in the study. The total sample size was 200 people, including 100 patients with focal epilepsy and 100 patients with GTCS. The tools used included demographic profile form, Men Sexual Health Questionnaire (MSHQ), Sexual Quality of Life-Men (SQOL-M) and Premature Ejaculation Diagnostic Tool (PEDT). The method of conducting the study was in such a way that the patients who referred to specialized clinics and hospitals and met the conditions for entering the study were included in the study. Then, the extracted data were entered into SPSS statistical software.

Results: Result showed, the M(SD) age of the patients in the focal epilepsy group was equal to 30.18(3.85). M(SD) score of MSHQ tool was equal to 51.81 (11.98), SQOL-M tool was equal to 34.75 (9.36) and PEDT tool was equal to 8.63 (4.79). In this study, although the M(SD) of the PE score in the focal epilepsy group was reported to be 9.17 (4.49) higher than that of the GTCS group with a rate of 8.09 (5.04), but this difference was not significant. also, the findings showed that there was a significant relationship between the status of the PEDT score, the status of the SQOL-M score, and the MSH score ($p<0.05$). MSHQ score and SQOL-M score were reported to be lower in patients with PE disorder.

Question:

Provide more background on epilepsy, including prevalence and impact on quality of life. - Include a clearer rationale for comparing focal vs. generalized epilepsy in

terms of PE. - State your specific hypotheses.

Reply:

Epilepsy is one of the neurological disorders whose main characteristic is the presence of spontaneous and repeated seizures. Epilepsy affects about 3 to 5 percent of different populations around the world, which causes psychological and social pressures on the patient[1, 2]. In fact, repeated and unpredictable convulsions cause physical and mental problems that ultimately reduce the quality of life of patients[3]. The incidence of epilepsy in the world is estimated at 61.4 per 100,000 person-years, which is much higher in low/middle-income countries[4].

Diseases related to the brain and nervous system are a group of diseases that have a high prevalence and leave many side effects for the patient[5-7]. Epilepsy is one of the diseases of the brain and nervous system, which can affect the sexual function of the patient[8, 9]. The studies conducted in the field of sexual problems of patients with epilepsy are limited and few studies have addressed this issue. But according to the aforementioned studies, the status of sexual problems in patients with epilepsy has been reported to be higher than other patients[9-11]. In fact, in patients with epilepsy, spermatozoa concentration and seminal fluid have a lower volume and concentration, and this factor has been effective on the lack of sexual satisfaction in these patients[12].

Question:

Provide more details on how epilepsy diagnoses were confirmed. - Clarify if any power analysis was done to determine sample size. - Describe any steps taken to control for potential confounding variables.

Reply:

In this study, patients who had a confirmed medical case for epilepsy and this case was approved by a neurologist were included in the study.

Question:

Consider including a table summarizing key demographic and clinical characteristics by epilepsy type. - Provide effect sizes in addition to p-values where relevant. - A figure visualizing the key PE score comparisons could enhance clarity.

Reply:

Table1-Demographic characteristics of patients with epilepsy in the studied groups

Variable	Focal epilepsy	GTCS	Total epilepsy

		N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Education	**High school or below**	49(49)	47(47)	96(48)
	University	51(51)	53(53)	104(52)
Economic status	**Weak**	65(65)	54(54)	119(59.5)
	Moderate	33(33)	40(40)	73(36.5)
	Good and excellent	2(2)	6(6)	8(4)
Children	**None**	57(57)	64(64)	121(60.5)
	One or more	43(43)	36(26)	79(39.5)
Spouse education	**High school or below**	38(38)	47(47)	85(42.5)
	University	62(62)	53(53)	115(57.5)
Exercise	**Yes**	18(18)	12(12)	30(15)
	No	82(82)	88(88)	170(85)
Smoking	**Yes**	14(14)	17(17)	31(15.5)
	No	86(86)	83(83)	169(84.5)
Age	**M(Sd)**	30.09(3.66)	30.27(4.05)	30.18(3.85)

Result Table 1 showed, the M(SD) age of the patients in the focal epilepsy group was equal to 30.09(3.66), in the GTCS group it was equal to 30.27(4.05) and in all patients, it was equal to 30.18(3.85). Also, 15% of all patients had the experience of doing sports and 15.5% of them had the experience of smoking.

Question:

Expand on potential mechanisms that may explain your findings. - Address limitations of the study more thoroughly. - Discuss clinical implications and directions for future research more explicitly.

Reply:

One of the limitations of this study is the role of cultural factors. Considering that this study was conducted in Ilam city, some patients may refrain from mentioning sexual problems due to cultural issues. For this reason, it is suggested to conduct more studies with a larger sample size.

Question:

Proofread carefully for minor grammatical and spelling errors throughout. - Ensure consistent formatting of numbers, units, and statistical notation. I believe addressing these points will strengthen your manuscript. Please submit your revised version along with a point-by-point response to these suggestions. Thank you for your contribution to Archives of Neuroscience.

Reply:

All suggested items were corrected. For example, all references were corrected to unify the article. All periods and commas have been corrected.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 2 Aug 2024 – 3 Aug 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer — ACCEPT 2 Aug 2024

Thank you.

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 3 Aug 2024

Dear EIC.
Previous errors have been corrected, and there are no further recommendations.

Editor-in-Chief — ACCEPT 3 Aug 2024

Dear Authors,
Thank you for your explanation, and I find your manuscript acceptable.