

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_98828
Title of the Manuscript:	Ischemic stroke in young adult patients: Excess of Factor VIII
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalijr2h.com/index.php/IJR2H/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The purpose of the manuscript is to present a case of an ischemic stroke in a young adult patient.</p> <p>The topic is significant, interesting and not well studied. Such cases are rare and their presentation is important for the medical community.</p> <p>The paper is in line with the scope of the journal and is a valuable contribution both to our knowledge and to practice.</p> <p>Yet, the paper needs some revisions in order to be accepted for publication.</p> <p>The title is OK but the authors may delete the plural in "patients" as only one case is included in the text.</p> <p>The abstract is good, the structure of the manuscript is appropriate and the paper is scientifically correct. The references are sufficient but the authors have to check the reference list again. Example No. 2 (Conlan MG, Folsom AR, Finch A, Davis CE, Sorlie P, Marcucci G, et al. Associations of factor VIII and von Willebrand factor with age, race, sex, and risk factors for atherosclerosis. Thromb Haemost. 1993;70 (09):380-5) is missing in the text.</p> <p>A careful second read will avoid minor mistakes as missing commas, etc. Recommendation: If possible, consider increasing the size of the figures. Now it is necessary to zoom the illustrations to see the details.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is OK	
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:	Malina Jordanova
Department, University & Country	Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Bulgaria