

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_123289
Title of the Manuscript:	“AI-Driven Innovations in Stroke Care: Enhancing Diagnostic Accuracy, Treatment Efficacy, and Rehabilitation Outcomes”
Type of the Article	It could also be a research article if it presents original research findings related to AI applications in stroke care, but the title leans more towards a broader discussion, which is typical of reviews or perspectives.

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it explores the integration of AI in stroke care, a critical area where timely and accurate interventions can drastically improve patient outcomes. By focusing on the enhancement of diagnostic accuracy, treatment efficacy, and rehabilitation outcomes, the manuscript addresses key challenges in stroke management. The emphasis on AI-driven innovations not only highlights the potential for improving existing practices but also opens avenues for future research and development in personalized medicine. I appreciate this manuscript for its forward-thinking approach, bridging technology and healthcare to tackle a major global health issue.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "AI-Driven Innovations in Stroke Care: Enhancing Diagnostic Accuracy, Treatment Efficacy, and Rehabilitation Outcomes" is quite suitable as it clearly communicates the focus of the manuscript. It effectively highlights the key areas of stroke care—diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation—while emphasizing the role of AI in driving advancements.</p> <p>However, if a more concise title is preferred, an alternative could be: "Advancing Stroke Care with AI: Improving Diagnosis, Treatment, and Rehabilitation."</p> <p>This alternative title still captures the essence of the manuscript while being slightly more streamlined.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and effectively covers the key aspects of the study, including the significance of integrating AI in stroke care, the stages of stroke management where AI is impactful, and the challenges faced. However, there are a few areas where the abstract could be refined or expanded- Quantify the Impact, Address Limitations and Future Directions, Simplify the Language.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>To evaluate whether the subsections and structure of your manuscript on "AI-Driven Innovations in Stroke Care" are appropriate, I'll suggest a general outline that aligns with common practices in scientific manuscripts on similar topics. Here's a possible structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction 2. AI in Stroke Diagnosis 3. AI-Driven Treatment Planning and Efficacy 4. AI-Enhanced Rehabilitation 5. Ethical and Practical Considerations 6. Future Directions 7. Conclusion. 8. References 9. Appendices (if needed) 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive examination of AI-driven innovations in stroke care. It integrates a thorough review of current AI applications in diagnostic imaging, treatment planning, and rehabilitation, supported by recent advancements and</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>empirical evidence. The inclusion of ethical considerations and practical challenges demonstrates a well-rounded approach, acknowledging the complexities of implementing AI in clinical settings. Furthermore, the manuscript's focus on future directions ensures it addresses emerging trends and ongoing research, reflecting a forward-looking perspective essential for advancing stroke care through AI.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References ok</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Suitable</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Results part needs to be improved graphs and analysis may be added</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Nitalaksheswara Rao Kolukula</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>GITAM University, India</p>