

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_127696
Title of the Manuscript:	PROFILE OF PATIENTS WITH ISCHEMIC STROKE ACCIDENT IN A REGIONAL HOSPITAL IN THE INTERIOR OF PIAUÍ
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: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I'm Shure that this article has Highley importance. Thus a potential for the further research. I didn't find counterseal details. This article is new and details are important especially for this particular geographical region.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The article is suitable. It would be interested to see a more longitudinal base of the research, but the time scale for the present one is strong enough.	
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.	Yes, it comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, It scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient. But I would go for a bit longer discussion part, it would create a more stronger research background.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I enjoyed reading the article itself. The article has a very interesting details and thoughts which are precisely seen between the lines.	

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Andrejeva Julija</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Klaipėdos valstybinė kolegija, Lithuania</b>