



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_42208
Title of the Manuscript:	STROKE SEVERITY VARIATIONS IN A 12 MONTH PROSPECTIVE STUDY INVOLVING SUB-ACUTE STROKE SURVIVORS WITH AND WITHOUT COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT IN NNEWI, NIGERIA
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>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction is too long (In discussion section) what parameter was taken to assess neural plasticity. Article will look better if you add one parameter of functional improvement	1. The discussion has been substantially reduced. From initial 1257 to 929 words 2. The original intention was to determine variations in stroke severity amongst cognitive and non-cognitive subacute stroke survivors. Therefore reduction in stroke severity as measured by National Institute of Health Stroke (NIHSS) indicates improvement in plasticity. So NIHSS is indirectly measuring neural plasticity since it is a systematic assessment tool that provides a quantitative measure of stroke-related neurological deficit. The scale is widely used today as a clinical assessment tool to check severity of stroke, to decide proper treatment, and to predict patient outcome. 3. The authors feel that NIHSS as an outcome measure is competent taking the objective of the study into consideration. 4. We appreciate however the wonderful input of the reviewers,
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		