

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_118961
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute ischemic event of bilateral total internal carotid artery
Type of the Article	Case report

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.journalajcrah.com/index.php/AJCRMH/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>The manuscript describes the rare bilateral total internal carotid artery occlusion, a significant and challenging condition in cerebrovascular disease. It provides valuable insights into a complex cerebrovascular event's clinical presentation, diagnostic approach, and management.</p> <p>The importance of this manuscript for the scientific community lies in several aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Bilateral occlusion of the internal carotid arteries is an uncommon phenomenon, and this case report contributes to the limited literature on this topic. It offers a detailed description of the clinical scenario, which can be beneficial for clinicians to recognize and manage similar cases effectively. o The manuscript highlights the role of advanced imaging techniques such as CT and MRI in the diagnosis of acute ischemic stroke. It provides a practical understanding of the imaging findings that correlate with the clinical presentation, which is crucial for early and accurate diagnosis. o The case report discusses the use of thrombectomy as a treatment option for large vessel occlusion, even when performed several hours after the onset of symptoms. This information is relevant for neurologists and interventional radiologists who manage acute stroke patients. o The document discusses the prognosis of patients with multivessel occlusion, which is generally unfavorable. However, it also notes the potential for good outcomes with appropriate and timely intervention, an encouraging message for healthcare providers. o For medical students and residents, this case report serves as an educational tool, providing a real-world example of a rare condition and the multifaceted approach to its management. o The manuscript can stimulate further research into the mechanisms, optimal treatment strategies, and outcomes of bilateral carotid artery occlusion, contributing to the advancement of knowledge in the field of cerebrovascular disease. 	
<p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is generally suitable as it indicates the subject matter of the report The alternative title could be: "Bilateral total Internal Carotid Artery Occlusion: A Case Report of Acute Ischemic Stroke"</p>	
<p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p>	<p>The abstract should be enhanced by providing more detailed information about the patient's medical history, extent of myocardial infarction, and treatment outcomes, thereby making it more informative and relevant to readers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract should more clearly highlight the relevance of the case to the wider field of cerebrovascular disease and its management and make it more attractive to readers interested in the subject. • To further increase the comprehensiveness of the abstract, it is better to add a summary of the treatment results or the patient's condition after the intervention to the abstract. Additionally, including a sentence about the case's broader implications for clinical practice or future research can provide a more general overview of the case's significance. 	
<p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate for a case report. The document is organized into logical sections that guide the reader through the case presentation, discussion, and conclusion.</p>	
<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in several ways: However, there are some areas where the manuscript could be improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript should provide more specific details about the patient's medical 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>history, the extent of the infarction, and the treatment outcomes to make it more informative and relevant to readers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript uses some technical terms, such as "DWI," "ADC," and "FLAIR," which might be unfamiliar to non-experts. Providing brief explanations or definitions for these terms could enhance the manuscript's clarity (The full form of abbreviations should be given when they are first introduced. For example, the complete form of DWI and ADC is introduced after several iterations! The full form of FLAIR has not been introduced at all). • The article should more explicitly demonstrate how this case contributes to the wider understanding of cerebrovascular disease and its management, thereby engaging readers who are keenly interested in this area of study. This will make the article more attractive and relevant to those interested in the topic. 	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	It is better to use more new references.	
<u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>		
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language and quality of the article is generally suitable for scientific communication, but there are some minor grammatical errors that need to be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	The cases have been announced in the previous sections.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Firoozeh Alavian
Department, University & Country	Farhangian University, Iran