

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_130487
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Relationship between Residence, and Income on Psychological Distress among Individuals with Idiopathic Epilepsy in Delhi NCR Hospital Settings
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript contributes significantly to the scientific community by presenting novel insights and advancing our understanding of psychological distress in patients diagnosed with epilepsy. The findings offer a new perspective on the psychological challenges faced by these patients, which could have important implications for future research and practical applications in both clinical settings and therapeutic interventions. By exploring the intersection of mental health and epilepsy, this work deepens our knowledge, offering valuable data that may guide future studies. Furthermore, it stimulates further inquiry into the complexities of epilepsy care, fostering progress and collaboration within the scientific community.	Thank you for your comments
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. The use of the word 'influence' suggests a longitudinal study design, which was not the case in this study. I suggest using Exploring the relationship between Residence, and Income on Psychological distress among individuals with idiopathic Epilepsy inDehi(Setting)	Title is corrected as per suggestions.
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.	What does NCR stand for? I suggest spelling it out. Add which statistical tests were used. Writing “education” leaves it hanging. Do you mean highest Education level attained education? If so, be explicit. Revise this statement; did you only sample those with idopathic epilepsy? If so, it is not clear.I suggest you make it clear. Focus your conclusion on the key findings of the study. Education was not further explored after table 1. Why? I suggest you describe in the methods step by step how you analysed the data. What informed your decisions. Which decisions you based on to keep variables on the final model.	Added full form of NCR. Study was designed to study the idiopathic epileptic patient. Education was explored further in Table-2 with mean score.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate, but it is lacking some key information that would enhance clarity. I have made several suggestions within the manuscript to address these points with suggestions.	Suggestions are incorporated.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient.	Thank you
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language quality is suitable for scholarly communications.	Thank you
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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