

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 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	This article uses clinical data to evaluate the ROSIER scale and obtain a series of ROC curves, including sensitivity and specificity. But I have a series of concerns: 1. First, there is already a higher level of evidence that has been aggregated (meta-analysis) on the ROSIER scale(A systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of recognition of stroke in the emergency department (ROSIER) scale). A higher quality of evidence is obtained, thus making the clinical evidence from a small sample appear dwarfed. 2. In addition, I suggest that you describe your statistical methods more clearly, including whether to use adjusted ANOVA, and Fisher's test. In addition, whether the data conform to a normal distribution, and whether the non-normally distributed data use a nonparametric test. 3. There are some problems in the results part, all the data are simply stated, and some regular expressions are not used. The Discussion section, on the other hand, largely describes the resulting data, which is superfluous. It would be inappropriate to even include specific P-values. 4. In addition, for the table, it is recommended to use a general three-line table instead of a closed table. 5. It is recommended that the ROSIER scale be placed in the appendix, not necessarily in the methodology section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yu Shen
Department, University & Country	Nanchang University, China