

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_124375
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk Factor Profile of Ischemic Stroke Patients
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Compulsory Revision Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Importance of the Manuscript for the Scientific Community: This manuscript provides significant insights into the risk factor profile of ischemic stroke patients, which is critical for the development of preventive strategies. The identification of key risk factors such as hypertension, obesity, and smoking habits, particularly in a specific population group, can help healthcare professionals in Indonesia and globally to target high-risk individuals more effectively. However, a more detailed analysis of the clinical implications and the potential for future research based on these findings could further enhance the manuscript's contribution to the scientific community.2. Title Suitability: The current title, "Risk Factor Profile of Ischemic Stroke Patients," is suitable. It accurately reflects the content and scope of the study. No alternative title is required, but please add the participants, study area and country with this title.3. Abstract Comprehensiveness: The abstract is mostly comprehensive, but it would benefit from a clearer mention of the study's limitations. Including this will make the abstract more balanced and provide a fuller understanding of the research scope.4. Subsections and Structure: The subsections are appropriate, but it would be useful to add a subsection focusing on the limitations of the study and the potential implications for future research. The structure generally follows a logical flow but could be enhanced by explicitly stating the study's hypothesis or research question.5. Scientific Correctness: The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The use of descriptive statistics to analyze the risk factors is appropriate for the retrospective study design. The large sample size and the detailed breakdown of risk factors, including lifestyle and demographic characteristics, provide valuable insights. However, the discussion could benefit from a deeper analysis of how these findings relate to existing global data and how they might influence healthcare policies in Indonesia.6. References Sufficiency: The references are sufficient but could be enhanced by adding more recent sources from the last two to three years. Including references that focus on similar studies in different regions would strengthen the global context of the manuscript. <p>Minor Revision Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Language and English Quality: The language quality is generally suitable, but a few minor grammatical adjustments could improve clarity. For example, the sentence structure in the results section could be streamlined for better readability. <p>Optional/General Comments</p> <p>Overall, this manuscript offers important findings about ischemic stroke risk factors in Indonesia. With minor revisions and a deeper exploration of the clinical implications, this paper could make a valuable contribution to the field of stroke prevention and management.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Md. Nahid Uz Zaman
Department, University & Country	Dr. Jubeida Khaton Nursing Institute, Bangladesh