

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_126130
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A PROSPECTIVE OBSERVATIONAL STUDY ON INCIDENCE, IMPLICATIONS AND MANAGEMENT OF SEIZURES FOLLOWING STROKE</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Observational study</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Considering the high incidence of stroke events in general population and the high level or associated morbidity, any research in this field is of great importance</li> <li>- The epidemiological information in this paper is valuable but it is presented in a basic manner and no further statistical correlation are performed to see how multiple risk factor can associate and their impact on prognosis</li> <li>- The limitation of the study is of great importance leading to a decrease in the value of the identified risk factors for seizures after stroke</li> <li>- I consider that the data base should be reevaluated, and further analysis should be performed to increase the values of this manuscript</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, it is.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The abstract is comprehensive, but I consider that it is presented in a telegraphic way and should be somehow modified in order to have grammatically correct and complete sentences.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Excepting the abovementioned aspects, the manuscript is properly structured.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As I previously emphasized, the data presented in this manuscript are correct but exposed in a basic manner.</li> <li>- It is not technically robust, and the manuscript lack more references and general guidelines recommendation about the management of stroke, seizures prophylaxis and so on.</li> <li>- The title confirm that the authors research the seizures after a stroke, but the conclusion are a bit confusing, especially the second paragraph, when it is stated that the leading cause of seizure in the stroke. Maybe this section should be rewritten having in mind the purpose of the study.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no, they are not. The subject of this article is of great importance nowadays and it is extensively studied.</li> <li>- further references and guideline regarding the management of stroke should be added</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The English version of the manuscript should be improved.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Every abbreviation should be explained at first appearance in the text, irrespective of the abstract section</li> <li>- The subsections of the introduction section are not necessary</li> <li>- The first and second paragraphs of the introduction section should have a reference or more</li> <li>- The references should be placed in the order of their appearance in the text. This paper has an important issue with the references and their placement.</li> <li>- The exact period of the study should be stated (e.g. from 1<sup>st</sup> of March 2023 until...)</li> <li>- The inclusion and exclusion criteria can be put in a diagram</li> <li>- Not sure about the need of presenting the study procedure if it does not contain something out of the ordinary</li> <li>- The figures titles should be changed</li> <li>- Every table should have a footer containing all the abbreviations explained and some further information, if needed</li> <li>- Maybe the figures can be optimized and uniformized and the authors can use the same background</li> <li>- The "Management" section has an important lack of references but contains actual guidelines recommendations regarding stroke treatment.</li> <li>- Again, in the Discussion section not all the paragraphs have references despite presenting general medical information, epidemiological data and so on...</li> <li>- Most part of the results should not be presented in such details in the discussion section</li> </ul>	

**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)
<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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Tiberiu Paul Neagu</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>"Carol Davila" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania</b></p>