

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53869

Date: 16/09/2025

Title: Ischemic Stroke in Young Adults: Emerging Trends and Risk Factors

### Recommendation:

- Accept as it is .....  
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....  
 Accept after major revision .....  
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr. S. K. Nath

Date: 17/09/2025

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

The paper effectively highlights the rising trend of ischemic stroke among young adults, underscoring the importance of lifestyle, socioeconomic factors, and diagnostic practices. It advocates for enhanced prevention, awareness, and early detection, especially in resource-limited settings. To strengthen the paper, incorporating quantitative synthesis of data, clarifying definitions, and improving structural coherence are recommended.

### Reviewer's Comment / Report

#### Strengths:

- Relevant and Timely Topic:** The paper addresses the increasing incidence of ischemic stroke among young adults, a significant public health concern with socioeconomic implications.
- Comprehensive Literature Review:** The review synthesizes recent studies (2009-2023), providing a broad perspective on trends, risk factors, diagnostic challenges, and prevention strategies.
- Clear Objectives and Methodology:** The research aims are well-defined, with a systematic approach to literature search, inclusion criteria, and analysis.
- Identification of Key Factors:** The study emphasizes modifiable lifestyle risk factors, diagnostic gaps, and socioeconomic disparities, offering insightful directions for intervention.
- Public Health Implications:** The discussion highlights the need for awareness campaigns, early detection, and targeted prevention, which are critical for policy-making.

#### Weaknesses:

- Limited Data Presentation:** The paper mentions various studies and findings but lacks detailed statistical data or meta-analytic results to quantify trends convincingly.
- Inconsistent Terminology and Definitions:** The paper occasionally fluctuates in defining age groups or diagnostic criteria (e.g., how "young adults" are classified), which could affect clarity.
- Structural Organization:** Certain sections (e.g., methodology, results, discussion) could benefit from clearer demarcation and logical flow to improve readability.
- Lack of Original Data or Analysis:** The study is predominantly a literature review without contributing new empirical data or novel analysis.
- Minor Typos and Grammatical Errors:** There are some typographical and grammatical issues that slightly hinder the readability.

#### Recommendations for Improvement:

- Data Presentation:** Include summarized tables or figures illustrating incidence trends, risk factor prevalence, or diagnostic delays to provide visual clarity.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. **Clarification of Definitions:** Clearly specify the age range for "young adults" consistently throughout the paper (e.g., 18–50 years).
3. **Structural Improvements:** Separate sections more distinctly: Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion. Summarize findings with subheadings for easier navigation.
4. **Language and Grammar:** Proofread for typographical errors (e.g., "Larrue et al., 2011 To see the gap in diagnosis by the doctors." – should be revised for clarity). Correct grammatical mistakes for professional tone. Avoid inconsistencies in tense and phrasing.
5. **Addition of Empirical Data:** Where possible, include statistical summaries or meta-analyses to support assertions about trends and risk factors.

### Minor Errors & Typos Identified:

- Inconsistent spacing and punctuation (e.g., missing commas after author names).
- Sentence fragments or awkward phrasing in some sections (e.g., "To see the gap in diagnosis by the doctors." – needs rephrasing).
- Capitalization inconsistencies (e.g., "stroke" vs. "Stroke" in headings).