

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JPRI_76082 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A STUDY ON PRESCRIBING PATTERNS AND ASSESSING THE FUNCTIONAL OUTCOMES IN CEREBRAL STROKE PATIENTS |
| Type of the Article | Short Research Article |

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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>The manuscript is written in a fairly acceptable language despite suffering inaccuracies of structure, styling and presentation. The paper reveals risk factors for stroke, with nice generalized concusions on how improve functional outcomes of stroke patients. The structure, style and presentation of the manuscript needs to be worked upon. Authors should structure their paper by following the STROBE guidelines of observational studies' manuscript writing. (link https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/strobe/)</p> <p>The methods and results sections of the manuscript are missing.</p> <p>There was Inadequate discussion of findings. In addition to mixing of findings within the discussion section.</p> <p>Too much has been written but not cited. Authors should consider reciting and referencing their work more properly.</p> <p>I recommend authors to avoid an active language and instead utilize a passive language when rewriting out their paper.</p> <p>The paired T-test graph lacks a title and it should be better presented.</p> <p>There are mixed citation formats used. I recommend authors sticking to journal's preferred citation style alone.</p> | <p>The methodology and the results section was added.</p> <p>All the corrections are made.</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>I recommend authors getting a native English speaker to copyedit their manuscript before resubmission.</p> <p>Table 1.1 and 1.7 should be modified to appear like the rest of the nice tables.</p> <p>Endeavour to define all abbreviations at the time they are first used.</p> <p>Have a uniform use of brackets. i recommend the format XX (Y%).</p> <p>References appear way below the would be expected number of references basing on the written introduction and discussion sections. Please work on this.</p> | <p>All the necessary corrections are made.</p> <p>All the abbreviations are defined in the first use.</p> |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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> | No ethical issues. |