

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_105499</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Investigating the Long-Term Cognitive Impairments of Stroke: A Systematic Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Systematic Review</b>

### **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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>  The authors present the results of a systematic review aimed to examine the long-term cognitive impairment of stroke patients and to contribute to the expanding understanding of post-stroke cognitive impairment, its pathophysiology, and available intervention. Finally 13 articles were reviewed. The authors found that cognitive impairment is a common sequel that happens after a stroke that can impact the patient and the caregiver's quality of life. The study is potentially interesting, but can be improved if the following considerations are addressed:	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It should be emphasized the relevance of stroke recurrence in vascular cognitive impairment. For example, cognitive impairment was a frequent finding in patients with multiple lacunar infarction recurrences (<i>J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry</i> 2007; 78: 1392-1394)</li> <li>Because cognitive impairment is an essential clinical feature of Binswanger's disease, I would suggest to expand the text in relation to cognitive profile of white matter hyperintensities and neuropsychological characteristics of subcortical vascular dementia (<i>Expert Rev Neurother</i> 2009; 9: 1201-1217).</li> <li>In the Discussion, it would be helpful to mention that future clinical trials in lacunar stroke patients should include a neuropsychological study because more than half of patients with a first-ever lacunar stroke and without cognitive impairment show minor neuropsychological alterations. These minor disturbances are mainly related to the presence of clinically silent lacunar infarcts, without any relationship to cognitive impairment with leukoaraiosis at this early stage of cerebral small vessel disease (see and comment the study published in <i>BMC Neurology</i> 2013; 13: 203). The follow-up of these patients might be interesting in order to assess whether neuropsychological disturbances are predictive factors of subcortical vascular dementia in the mid-term.</li> <li>The authors should indicate that an essential line of future research would be precisely the assessment of the impact of long-term cognitive impairments in patients with lacunar versus non-lacunar stroke. This recommendation is because the pathophysiology, prognosis and clinical features of lacunar strokes are different from other acute cerebrovascular diseases (<i>Int J Mol Sci</i> 2022; 23, 1497). Did the authors consider this in their study protocol?</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>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>A Arboix</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Barcelona, Spain</b>