

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_89219
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS AND UTILITY OF HAEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS IN CEREBROVASCULAR ACCIDENT PATIENTS- A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY IN TERTIARY CARE CENTRE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

<https://www.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors report a retrospective clinical observational study with the aim to identify hematological biomarkers in acute cerebrovascular disease. The authors demonstrated the presence of persistent altered status of hematological parameters as a simple inflammatory blood biomarkers. The study is potentially interesting, but can be improved if the following considerations are addressed: MAJOR CONSIDERATIONS A. The authors in the Discussion says that evaluated the hematological parameters for the prediction of recurrent vascular events, a topic that has not analyzed in the present study. B.The authors should clearly reflect whether there are hematological differences between patients with cerebral ischemia versus intracerebral hemorrhage	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Describe all acronyms used at first mention (Abstract/Introduction, etc). 2. It would be interesting to know the different ischemic stroke subtypes in the study population. 3. Acute stroke may be the presenting manifestation of hematological diseases (see and add this reference: Expert Rev Hematol 2016; 9: 891-901). This is a remarkable aspect that should be emphasized in the text. Did the authors consider this etiology in their clinical study?	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A Arboix
Department, University & Country	University of Barcelona, Spain