

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_INDJ_104568</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Primary endovascular thrombectomy in acute ischemic stroke in patients ineligible for intravenous thrombolysis</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/editorial-policy> )

### 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>1. The manuscript adds relevant information to the issue explored. NCDs are less researched into in LMICs particularly stroke. To the extended the study investigated treatment outcomes of Endovascular treatment (EVT) is commendable.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate.</p> <p>3. Abstract is well composed.</p> <p>4. Manuscript is well structured. However, the aim can be merged into introduction section.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically sound.</p> <p>6. References used are current and appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>It is highly recommended to have the paper grammar-checked and undergo stylistics and editing.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Uma Langkulsen</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Thammasat University, Thailand</b>