

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOCAMR_102725</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Correlation between Increased Leukocyte Counts in Patients with Acute Phase Hemorrhagic Stroke with Early Neurological Deterioration Events</b>
Type of the 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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the topic is relevant and can lead to important further studies and local health policies. Analysis is adequate and discussion well detailed.</p> <p>2. Title could be more clear that the association is with the neurological deterioration and not with the stroke</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Literature review is unnecessarily long and repeating information that was already mentioned in Introduction</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes</p> <p>Last sentence of Conclusion ses a bit random, it would be nice to explain how the diet and other habits could affect those outcomes, like mentioning the inflammation</p> <p>The time horizon observed is said as ending in December 2019 in Introduction and December 2020 in Methods. And in December 2019 in Results.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Format is not standardized</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Paula Medeiros do Valle</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Instituto de Medicina Social, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</b>