

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_130710
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Post-Stroke Cognitive Impairment and Dementia in a Sudanese Cohort: A Single-Center Retrospective Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study is very important and comes at a critical time, as there is a shift in life expectancy, with Africans living longer and becoming more exposed to age-related illnesses such as stroke and cognitive impairment. This study will shed more light on these issues and serve as a cornerstone for further research in this area.	Thanks for the comments
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The methodology was not clearly described, but it appears to be a cross-sectional study rather than a retrospective one. This is because a cognitive assessment tool cannot be administered retrospectively to older records. Therefore, you should either remove the study design from the title or revise it to indicate that the study is cross-sectional.</p> <p>The title is somewhat misleading because it mentions dementia, yet there is nothing in the study suggestive of dementia. Dementia is a severe form of cognitive impairment, and therefore, I suggest the title be reframed to accurately reflect the focus of the study, which was not on dementia. For example: "Prevalence of Post-Stroke Cognitive Impairment in a Sudanese Cohort: A Single-Center cross-sectional Study."</p>	Noted and revised
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>It is comprehensive but requires a few improvements as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please state the level of significance used in the analysis.2. Ordinal logistic regression is used to determine predictors rather than associations.3. The conclusion appears controversial because, while the results did not capture the prevalence of PSCI (post-stroke cognitive impairment) and dementia, the conclusion stated that PSCI was highly prevalent in this Sudanese stroke cohort. Please ensure that the results capture the prevalence of both dementia and PSCI to align with the conclusion.	Thanks for the comments revised
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is in line with current knowledge; however, dementia is a cognitive impairment on its own. The study did not address dementia in its totality in the introduction and did not differentiate it from PSCI. Additionally, among post-stroke patients, we expect the prevalence of vascular dementia to rise, but the author was silent on this. By default, when we talk about dementia without further explanation, it is assumed to mean Alzheimer's dementia.	Noted thanks
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are ok	Ok

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Considering the author is a Sudanese scientist, they have a fair command of English. However, I suggest the author use tools like Grammarly or Quillbot to refine their writing further, or ChatGPT to perfect the write-up.	
Optional/General comments	<div>1. The sample size estimation was not elaborated upon.</div> <div>2. The study design was only mentioned in the abstract. We expect the abstract to be a summary of the entire dissertation, but instead, it appears to be more detailed than the methodology itself.</div> <div>3. The inclusion and exclusion criteria were not elaborated.</div> <div>4. You need to discuss the MoCA (Montreal Cognitive Assessment) scale in detail.</div> <div>5. Please include the ethical clearance number.</div> <div>6. The details of each table should be presented before the table, and the interpretation of tables should not be lumped together. For figures, the interpretation should come after each figure.</div> <div>7. In your results, the Pearson p-value is used for the chi-square test, while the Exact p-value is for Fisher's Exact Test. Performing both tests on the same item is unnecessary repetition, as Fisher's Exact Test is used when the assumptions of the chi-square test are not fulfilled.</div> <div>8. In Table 3 for logistic regression, only gender and education were statistically significant at the bivariate analysis. Therefore, they are the only variables that should be included in the logistic regression model.</div>	<div>Thank you for your valuable comments. We have:</div> <div><div>1–7) Addressed each point by elaborating on the sample size, clarifying the study design, detailing inclusion/exclusion criteria, discussing the MoCA, adding ethical clearance, restructuring tables/figures, and ensuring correct statistical tests.</div><div>We note your suggestion to include only gender and education in the final model; however, our Table 3 shows that antiplatelets (p=0.036) and the statin+antiplatelet combination (p=0.031) were also significant at univariate. We retained near-significant factors for completeness while emphasizing that only education remained strongly predictive in the final adjusted model.</div></div> <div>Sincerely, The Authors</div>

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	