



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_68733
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSOCIATION BETWEEN RISK FACTORS AND NEW-ONSE SEIZURES IN OLD AGE POPULATION
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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>All my detailed comments are in the manuscript (doc. file)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is necessary to write at the end of the "Introduction" the purpose of this study. 2. In "Materials and Methods" the description (general characteristics) of the studied groups of patients should be presented in the form of a table. 3. In "Materials and Methods" there should be a section <i>Statistical Analysis</i>. 4. Several sentences in "Results" and "Discussion" duplicate the information "Materials and Methods". 5. In this type study the phrase "Pearson correlation coefficient was applied that shows p-value of 0.001" is not correct. The Pearson correlation coefficient is used for quantitative rather than qualitative features. For qualitative features, for example, the Phi association coefficient is used. Pearson's correlation coefficient shows the degree of the relationship between the compared features, and not the p-value. 6. In "Results", I recommend to make only two tables (separately for men and women). In these tables it will be necessary to indicate the p-value for each risk factor separately (and not totally in the group). Where statistically significant differences are found, calculate the odds ration (OR) and 95% CI for it, and also indicate the phi- association coefficient. I gave an example of such a table in the text of the manuscript. 7. Based on the data presented in the manuscript, one cannot talk about the association of seizures with age, because the age of patients in the control group is within the same range. To do such a conclusion, it was necessary to compare the frequency of seizures in cohorts of young, middle and old age patients. Perhaps this will be more pronounced if the authors present data separately for men and women. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make changes to the abstract (remove uninformative numbers from it, but add p-value, 95% CI for frequency data) (all my detailed comments are in the manuscript). 2. It is desirable to indicate the ethnicity of the studied patients. 3. The manuscript must include a list of abbreviations. 	
Optional/General comments	no	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Irina Olegovna Suchkova
Department, University & Country	Federal State Budget Scientific Institution, Russia