



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_48667
Title of the Manuscript:	Abnormal changes in some haemostatic parameters in first-ever stroke Patients in Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Type of the 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>)

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 aim of this study was to measure selected hemostatic parameters in first-ever stroke patients. The study was performed in 54 stroke patients and 54 sex- and age-matched control subjects. The results are of interest but there are also some concerns to be addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) All abbreviations used in the Abstract should be explained in the abstract itself to make it understandable without referring to the main text. 2) Contrary to that what is stated in the text, this study is not prospective. 3) It should be specified at what time relative to stroke onset the blood was withdrawn for analysis. If the blood was collected in the acute phase, changes in hemostatic parameters could represent the secondary acute phase response. 4) Statistical analysis: it should be specified how quantitative variables were compared between groups. 5) Numerical values of hemostatic parameters presented in Table 3 should not be repeated in the text. Instead, percentage differences between groups could be mentioned in the text. 6) Because some hemostatic parameters differed between sexes (Table 4), it would be of interest to present these data for healthy and stroke patients stratified by sex. 7) Did hemostatic variables differ between ischemic and hemorrhagic stroke? 8) More details about stroke patients such as co-morbidities and well-known risk factors (hypertension, dyslipidemia, diabetes) as well as preceding medical therapies should be included as these factors may affect hemostatic parameters. 9) Discussion section should be shortened. The effect of age and sex on stroke risk is well-recognized and does not need to be discussed. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Jerzy Beltowski</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Medical University, Poland</i>