Paper: **"Detección Temprana de Epilepsia Pediátrica: Progresión de los Electrodos en EEG"**

Corresponding Author: Jay Molino

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Walter Valverde
Universidad de Panama, Panama

Reviewer 2: Vitor de Castro Gomes
Rio de Janeiro State University, Brazil

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Walter Valverde MD	
University/Country: Universidad de Panama – Panama	
Date Manuscript Received: 01-03-2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 01-14-2023
Manuscript Title: El avance de los electrodos del electroencefalograma para detector epilepsia pediatrica	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No YES You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)	

The title is long, I think it can be abbreviated and reflect the information content shown in the article. I recommend substituting the word advance for: progress, evolution, development or improvement.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
(Please insert your comments) **Objective shown** **Methodology : The methodology used to collect the bibliography is not mentioned.** **Results : partially shown**	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
(Please insert your comments) **I did find some minor grammatical errors.**	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
This is not a clinical research work, it is a bibliographic review, I recommend that you indicate what was the methodology for the search of the bibliographic support. Also separate the search methods from the results of your bibliographic research	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
(Please insert your comments) **The results suggest a benefit of some electrodes. The scientific basis is still limited due to the limited quality of the studies shown in the bibliography, I consider that by better ordering the structure of the article they can improve the way of giving us the information.**	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
(Please insert your comments) **I see a coincidence between the content and the conclusions**	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
(Please insert your comments) **There is an acceptable number of bibliographic citations from the last 5 years and they are adequately written, however I consider that they can still improve the source of information by doing a more extensive bibliographic search.**	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	

Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): I believe that with the suggested changes you can greatly improve the quality of the information. It is a good and interesting effort by these authors and they deserve another chance once the article is improved.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Vitor de Castro Gomes	
University/Country: Rio de Janeiro State University / Brazil	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: **El Avance de los electrodos del electroencefalograma para detectar la Epilepsia Pediátrica**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: /Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
The title expresses appropriately the objectives of the study. However, it would be clearer if stated the eventual conclusions.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
In the same manner, the abstract would be improved if the methods and conclusions were stated.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The manuscript is well written.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
This is a problem of this study, because it was not stated the type o method used, which is directly related with the absence of description of the type of review made: it was a Systematic Review? A Critical Review? A Meta-analysis? It seems that the authors were interested in a Systematic Review. In this case, I suggest the use of procedures specially developed for this kind of situation, like the COSMIN protocol, for example. Moreover, I would suggest that the authors decide which categories of comparison are relevant in this specific subject and construct a table indicating how the new electrodes technologies are showing improvement in relation to the classical EEG methods. Also, this comparison should be made not only with the classical methods, but between the new technologies themselves. This table would be even more complete if they indicate the studies which developed/tested the technology in question.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
Some results are stated in the text, but in my opinion, they were not objectively analyzed.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
The conclusions are short, and do not sum up all studies described.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Yes.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: