

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_127218
Title of the Manuscript:	Prescription practice of brivaracetam for managing epilepsy across different patient populations: A survey among Indian clinicians
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of interest because the authors have done work close to pharmacovigilance in order to guide clinicians in the management of epilepsy. Epilepsy is a disease that requires fast-acting treatment, and we're faced with a panoply of drugs whose choice is often restrictive.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The methodological approach was well followed, and the results were well analyzed and discussed at length. Many of the results show selective prescribing in line with drug recommendations, with a preference for brivaracetam. These results, although insufficient to guide clinicians and alert drug manufacturers, provide a basis for improvement in epilepsy treatment.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Take into account comments made in the manuscript: 1. Please, add the Ethics approval number? 2. You primarily used AEM, why this (AEDs) appears here? 3. What do you mean with «all of the above» here? Please, choose other suitable word in this presentation (figure2). 4. What this (ASMs) means? Please harmonize them as AEM if it means same. 5. Please, define LEV and BRV at your first use.	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Relwende Justin Ouedraogo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique, Institut de Recherche Sciences de la Sante, Burkina Faso</b>