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Reviewer's report:

General

Although the topic is clearly worthy of discussion, the manuscript itself is a bit too wordy. One suggestion I would make would be to consider the use of tables (see below).

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

I would suggest that the text in Results, pp 4 - 7 could be summarized in a table with the following layout:

3 columns, one heading for each of the three systematic reviews

Rows with the following subjects:

Type of interventions evaluated: seven newer antiepileptic drugs etc.

Objective/ Scope/ Safety outcomes of interest e.g. specific AEs for antipsychotics, most common AEs for epilepsy etc.

Study designs included (subheaded): Randomized trials, Non-randomized studies from case reports to observational studies etc.

Studies identified: Large volume of literature (would be helpful if numbers were available e.g. 350 case reports or whatever)

Outcome or findings of review/ conclusions / data analysis: did review meet objectives, or yield clinically useful new conclusions, or add substantially to existing knowledge?

If this cannot be fitted into one table, the other option would be to draw up three tables, one for each systematic review.

The rest of the results section could then concentrate on specific issues with inclusion criteria and quality assessment (or this could be moved to discussion section, with relevant subheadings).

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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