

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_109796
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of collateral pathways in patients with extracranial carotid occlusion using transcranial color-coded sonography compared to digital subtraction angiography
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>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><b>Yes</b></p> <p>The title could be more concise while still capturing the essence of the research. Consider something like "Assessment of Collateral Pathways in Carotid Occlusion: Ultrasound vs. TCCS vs. DSA."</p> <p>The abstract is well-structured and provides a clear overview of the study. However, it might benefit from a brief mention of the clinical implications or potential advancements in diagnostic approaches. The introduction effectively highlights the significance of carotid occlusion and the limitations of traditional angiography. It might be useful to include a sentence summarizing the aim of the study at the end of the introduction. The methods section is comprehensive and well-organized.</p> <p>The references are well-cited and relevant to the study. Ensure consistency in formatting and consider using a citation management tool for accuracy.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The article is well-structured, but a concise conclusion summarizing the key findings and their implications could enhance the completeness of the paper.	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><b>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</b></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saba Wahid Khan
Department, University & Country	H K College of Pharmacy, University of Mumbai, India