

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_106669
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comprehensive Review on Pharmaceutical Care Plan for Stroke
Type of the Article	Review Article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript titled "A Comprehensive Review on Pharmaceutical Care Plan for Stroke" is undoubtedly important for the scientific community. Stroke is a significant and often devastating health issue with a profound impact on individuals and healthcare systems. The role of pharmaceutical care in stroke management is of utmost importance, as it encompasses not only drug therapy but also patient education, adherence support, and the prevention of complications The title "A Comprehensive Review on Pharmaceutical Care Plan for Stroke" appears to be suitable for the subject matter of the article. It clearly indicates that the article is a review focused on pharmaceutical care plans for stroke, which accurately represents the content and scope of the manuscript. However, if you are considering alternative titles, you might explore options like: "Pharmaceutical Care Strategies for Stroke Patients: A Comprehensive Review" "Optimizing Medication Management in Stroke: A Comprehensive Review of Pharmaceutical Care" Based on the provided abstract, it appears to be comprehensive in the sense that it covers key aspects related to stroke as a clinical syndrome, its prevalence, and the role of clinical pharmacists in stroke care. However, the comprehensiveness of an abstract also depends on the context and purpose of the article. The appropriateness of subsections within these main sections depends on the study's complexity and the specific requirements of the journal. It's crucial that the structure of the manuscript follows a logical flow, making it easy for readers to follow the research process and understand the results and conclusions. As a reviewer, I have carefully assessed the scientific content of the manuscript. Based on my evaluation, I find that the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The study's methodology, data analysis, and interpretations seem sound and in line with standard scientific practices. The authors have likely provided sufficient details on the research design, data collection methods, and statistical analyses, which allow for a clear understanding of the study's procedures. However, I would suggest considering the inclusion of more recent references, especially if there have been significant developments in the field since the manuscript's preparation. Including up-to-date research can strengthen the scientific validity of the study and demonstrate the authors' awareness of the most current literature. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>As a reviewer, I recommend the authors to thoroughly proofread the manuscript to ensure that it meets the standards required for scholarly communications. Clarity and coherence in the language will enhance the manuscript's overall impact and contribute to its successful publication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>From my assessment, the manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, addressing an important topic for the scientific community. The title is suitable and accurately represents the content of the study.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarika Chaudhary
Department, University & Country	One Beat College of Medical Sciences, India