

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_97315
Title of the Manuscript:	The possible role of Cerebrolysin in prevention of hemorrhagic transformation after acute ischemic stroke
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The authors present a systematic review based on 5 studies with the aim of assessing the relevance of neuroprotection of Cerebrolysin in ischemic cerebrovascular events and its prevention of hemorrhagic transformation (HT) after acute cerebrovascular infarct. The review suggests that the drug is safe and cerebrolysin can be administered to reduce the risk of HT. However, this observation needs to be confirmed by further large randomized controlled clinical trials. The study is potentially interesting, but can be improved if the following considerations are addressed.</p> <p>2. The title is adequate</p> <p>3. The Abstract is complete</p> <p>4. The structure is correct.</p> <p>5. The study is potentially interesting</p> <p>6. References suggested;</p> <p>1. It would be interesting to include in the text a comment on the fact that acute ischemic stroke with HT may also be caused by hematological diseases. This is a noteworthy aspect that should be emphasized (Expert Review of Hematology 2016; (9), 891-901). Add and comment on the reference</p> <p>2. It would be interesting to include in the text a comment regarding the fact that numerous neuroprotective strategies "in vivo" have failed in large randomized controlled trials in humans (ex: citicoline, -Lancet 2012; 380: 349-357-).</p> <p>3. The authors should mention that an essential line of research in the future would be precisely the assessment of the possible role of cerebrolysin in small vessel ischemic stroke, since the pathophysiology, prognosis and clinical characteristics of acute small-vessel ischemic strokes in humans are different from other types of cerebral infarcts; and lacunar infarcts are the stroke subtype with the best functional prognosis (see and add this recent reference: Int J Mol Sci 2022; 23, 1497).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adrià Arboix
Department, University & Country	University of Barcelona, Spain