

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_92498
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Effectiveness of the Recognition of Stroke in The Emergency Room Scale in Emergency Department of Suez Canal University Hospital
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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comments (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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please delete duplicated sentences on the ROSIER scale (see page 2 and page 3) 2. In Patients and Methods, please write the text according to the Journal's guidelines. 3. Authors should consider removing the NIHSS scoring from the text and, alternatively, add it as an appendix. 4. Please delete "consent contained" 5. In Results, please write the text following the rules of the Journal 6. Proofread the text for typographical errors (e.g., "Also Previous" in Discussion, etc.). 7. It would be interesting if the authors included in the text some of the limitations of their work <p>The authors present the results of a prospective cross-sectional study to assess the diagnosis of acute stroke versus stroke mimics in an Emergency Department of an Egyptian university hospital. The authors analyzed 92 consecutive patients with suspected stroke and found stroke mimics in 34.8% of cases. The ROSIER scale was a simple and effective screening tool for the recognition of acute stroke. The study is potentially interesting but can be improved if the following considerations are addressed:</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	8. Please Check references #7, #17 and #19.	
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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

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