



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JPRI_48724 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The Factors Related to Using Evidence-Based Guideline in Patients with Acute Ischemic Stroke |
| Type of the Article | Original 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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) |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> | <p>The Factors Related to Using Evidence-Based Guideline in Patients with Acute Ischemic Stroke</p> <p>I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected.</p> <p>The subject is interesting and important.</p> <p>In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort.</p> <p>I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments:</p> <p>-General comment:</p> <p>The authors write in the Abstract: ... in 1396 ???</p> <p>-Sample and sample size</p> <p>Please provide a flowchart.</p> <p>It seems that the sample size is calculated for the prevalence, but, was the sample size calculated for the comparison of the results between the groups? What were the hypothetical mean values or differences between groups, power, etc., to calculate the sample size?</p> <p>The authors could provide all the statistical parameters of their samples.</p> <p>-Discussion:</p> <p>The review of the literature should be more than cite the results of other authors. It should also be discussed the strengths and weaknesses of these studies, which should be provided a picture, albeit limited, of the state of knowledge and the main questions on the subject that these studies clarify and left unclear (e.g. by inadequate samples, incorrect design, testing erroneous statistics, characteristics of the persons studied, etc.).</p> <p>-Conclusion:</p> <p>It is important in any scientific paper to point out the problems that, from the current study, are still pending solution or clarification.</p> <p>-References:</p> <p>Review, please, the rules of the Journal.</p> | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | The abbreviations of journals should conform to those of the US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed (available in: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals) | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| 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> | |

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Jose Luis Turabian |
| Department, University & Country | Regional Health Service of Castilla la Mancha , Spain |