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Reviewer's report:

Review of The Prevalence of Psychosis in Epilepsy; A systematic review and Meta –Analysis

This is an valuable and interesting article which attempts to establish a greater degree of certainty regarding the prevalence of psychosis through meta analysis. It is clearly written and well presented. The findings are relevant and credible.

The Introduction covers the key issues in this literature well. The methods section was clear. I think it would be helpful for regular readers to have a little more explanation of the meta analysis process and some information regarding how studies are weighted. Likewise in the tables, it would be helpful for readers if the n for each study was included to give a rough guide to relevance. Some commentary about prevalence rates and time periods could be useful. I assume these studies generally report point prevalence but some will have been over time periods complicating the comparisons.

With regard to the results, I am unclear if all possible studies have been included for the TLE alone prevalence. My study, Adams, 2008 has this type of data and was not included. I would have been happy to supply additional raw data if needed but was not contacted. There may be other studies not included artificially increasing the prevalence rates.

I would like to see some additional discussion regarding the rates in TLE specific studies and some commentary on whether this indeed implies psychosis is more common in TLE. My feeling is that it is unlikely to be and recent studies tend not to find a specific relationship when designed to look at this specifically. As the TLE specific studies are a subset of the greater meta analysis, the higher numbers may reflect statistical anomalies rather than representing a true difference between TLE and non TLE epilepsy. This issue is not comprehensively addressed in the discussion. In addition, this argument has been played out some time ago with Janice Stevens re evaluating the reported higher prevalence in Slater and Beard’s much earlier work. In order for this to be a systematic review of this topic, some commentary acknowledging this prior debate should be included.

You comment that prevalence measures derived form unrepresentative samples may overestimate psychiatric morbidity among epilepsy patients. However it is clear form the rates of PIP that some may be missed. I think it is important to
acknowledge that they may be over or under represented depending on the availability of psychiatric assessment, the frequency of review and potentially the knowledge base of the treating neurologist.

I like the possible mechanisms comments. Overall a high quality article that I think should address the TLE Psychosis rates a little more comprehensively.

Major Compulsory Revisions: None. It is a reasonable article without revision but not of great importance to the field.

Discretionary Revisions: Some acknowledgement of TLE rates and previous debate makes this paper significant. Without that I think it avoids the elephant in the room and does not significantly contribute to the question of prevalence.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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