



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_39142
Title of the Manuscript:	Neuropsychological Deficits in Children with Epilepsy in Ghana: A Study At Korle-Bu Teaching Hospital
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This is a study of 36 children in Ghana diagnosed with epilepsy and 36 age and gender matched controls comparing cognitive abilities and examining the role of medication adherence.</p> <p>Please clarify in abstract that the sample was 36 and 36</p> <p>Please explain how sample size was determined – is it large enough for the number of outcome variables studied?</p> <p>Please explain how the samples were recruited – volunteers? Selected by researchers? Physicians? Teachers?</p> <p>Did the children or parents or both sign consent? Or was it assent? What feedback was given to the children, parents, physicians?</p> <p>In the conclusion – “children are urged”. Children are not likely to be reading the manuscript. Their physicians might be – what should the physicians do? This sample is particularly interesting in that a belief in the supernatural cause of epilepsy exists in Ghana – how should physicians address this?</p>	<p>the sample size of 36 epileptic and 36 control group has been clarified in the abstract</p> <p>Sample size determination has been justified</p> <p>How the samples were recruited has also been clarified</p> <p>Those who signed the consent form are now clarified.</p> <p>The feedback was not provided before the manuscript was written and so do not come in this manuscript. Moreover, because of confidentiality, the outcome was not traced to individual respondent. The feedback was there presented to the authorities of the hospital to take decision on it and so the researchers cannot be specific on it here. Clarification has been made on what to be done to do away with the belief in the supernatural cause of epilepsy exists in Ghana</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>When speaking of the reliability of a scale – what is meant test-retest reliability? Inter rater reliability?</p>	<p>We are not aware of making use of test-retest or inter rater reliability anywhere. Even if we did use, we don't think it is needed to explain what they meant as far as manuscript is concern.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The introduction is too long and seems unstructured. The most interesting part is the problem of supernatural beliefs re epilepsy. This deserves a paragraph of its own. The rest should be shortened.</p> <p>Please carefully go over the sentence structure – there are some obscure sentences.</p>	<p>The introduction has been shortened</p> <p>The sentence structure has been carefully reviewed.</p>