



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_48974
Title of the Manuscript:	CEREBRAL HEMODYNAMICS IN CHRONIC DISORDERS OF CEREBRAL CIRCULATION
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is a clinical-radiological report regarding cerebral venous hemodynamics in patients with a history of hypertension who suffer from chronic cerebral ischemia. The paper is quite interesting since it points out the connection between the neurological symptoms and the MRI of the brain with venography (MRV) beside the Doppler investigations of extra- and intra-cranial vessels. Authors also report the abnormalities of white matter which have great importance to evaluate the degree of cognitive decline/disorder in patients.</p> <p>Article is straightforward and conveys information deep enough the introduce the reader to the topic. However, there are some concerns the authors should deal with before accepting it for publication.</p> <p>Introduction Rephrase the "It is known that in the reactions of cerebral auto regulation of cerebral circulation play major role violations of the venous circulation", since is not clear cut which is the meaning of "major role violations"; Line 27: substitute "etc" with adequate structures that have been omitted; Lines 44-46: it is not clear cut the meaning of "in violation of...": it should be enough the authors just better define the violation.</p> <p>Materials and Methods Line 60: MRI is repeated twice. Line 65: Please define what a "magneist solution" is.</p> <p>Results and discussion Line 88: please define what paltosenosova tests are. The main text is difficult to follow and somewhat confusing. In order to improve readability, authors should consider to divide the Results section in subheadings such as to distinguish at glance results from Control group, CCI I and CCI II. Lines 170-172: quotations have not been numbered</p> <p>Findings section Authors should consider to change to Conclusions the denomination of this subheading, since Findings is reminiscent of Results that have already discussed above.</p> <p>Graphs - eliminate the Russian spelling form graphs.</p>	<p>Correction made in the manuscript</p> <p>Cortrected</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
Minor REVISION comments	English language need spelling and phrasing check	Revised for grammar
Optional/General comments		