

Review of: "Surgical treatment of Temporal Lobe Epilepsy: comparative results of selective amygdalohippocampectomy versus anterior temporal lobectomy from a referral center in Brazil"

Ayataka Fujimoto

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

This is a paper about ATL vs. SAH in Brazil where medical costs is limited. I understand the points that the authors wanted to say. However, the seizure free rate, preoperative evaluation, decision making process etc. are not on the right truck in terms of the world standards. Since the authors insisted on the cost limitation in the article, you may be put more importance on the medical costs and outcome differences. Therefore, one of the ideas from me that this paper could be published in the future is the authors would review papers from developed countries and then you may compare your outcomes and the one from the other developed countries and resubmit as a review paper. Or, the authors can share the outcome with the domestic journals because the situation is close to each other.

Major issues

- #1. The purpose of this study was not shown.
- #2. Please state the hypothesis that ATL leads to better prognosis than SAH.
- #3. "The literature shows that both accesses have excellent results in seizure control and neuropsychological outcome [16]. Despite overall good results, some studies show a worse language performance in patients operated with left ATL. Similarly, SAH would have a worse outcome in epilepsy control [17][21]" should be in Introduction.
- #4. The paper needs each section such as Study design, Ethical statement and Statistical analysis.
- #5. I am sorry to say that I cannot believe all histopathological results showed hippocampal sclerosis.
- #6. Again, I must say another severe comment. The seizure free rates of both ATL and SAH are too low. In my impression, or I am skeptical that the preoperative evaluation was inappropriate.
- #7. Discussion is a section that the results should be discussed. This means the first half of Discussion is out of the focus.
- #8. I totally agree with the points in study limitations. However, since many countries that may afford to perform language examinations and invasive monitoring prior to ATL or SAH, the outcome of this study might be inappropriate. Therefore, the outcome of the study might not be applied to other countries. I have understood the situation in Brazil though.
- #9. Conclusion must reflect the outcome. However, the points 1) controversy of SAH vs ATL, 2) post-op language and memory, 3) patients' preference and 4) costs were not studied at all in this study.
- #10. The authors concluded "ATL may be the best...". However, comparison between the two groups.

Minor issues

#1. In Introduction, in paragraph 3, second line, Anterior should be anterior.