

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3603
Title of the Manuscript:	Cerebral Small Vessel Disease – A Longitudinal 10 Years Evidenced Study
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript contributes to the scientific community by offering longitudinal insights into the management of cerebral small vessel disease (CSVD) in a geriatric population, focusing on non-pharmacological interventions like physiotherapy. It underscores the importance of holistic care in improving quality of life and functional independence, which is crucial as the global elderly population grows. While the case study format limits generalizability, it provides a valuable foundation for further research on multidisciplinary approaches to CSVD management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title captures the study's focus but could be more precise and engaging. A suggested alternative is: "Longitudinal Management of Cerebral Small Vessel Disease: A 10-Year Case Study on Non-Pharmacological Interventions."	
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.	The abstract lacks clarity and structure. It should explicitly mention the study design, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. Adding a concise statement on the longitudinal improvements observed in pain management, functional independence, and cognitive health would make it more comprehensive. Deleting repetitive phrases and rephrasing unclear sentences will improve readability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are logically organized, but the presentation can be improved by clearly delineating methods, results, and discussion. Some sections, such as the introduction and discussion, contain redundant information that could be streamlined for better flow.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript provides valuable insights into CSVD and highlights the benefits of physiotherapy as a prophylactic approach. While scientifically sound, it lacks rigorous statistical analysis and detailed methodology, which limits its robustness. Despite this, the longitudinal nature of the study and the focus on a single subject provide unique insights into personalized care approaches, making the manuscript technically relevant.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references cited are relevant but include some older studies. Incorporating more recent works on CSVD, neurodegenerative disorders, and geriatric physiotherapy would strengthen the scientific grounding. For example, newer systematic reviews or meta-analyses on physiotherapy's role in managing neurodegenerative diseases could be valuable additions.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language and Grammar: The manuscript requires thorough proofreading to correct grammatical errors, improve sentence structure, and enhance scholarly tone. Terminology: Define acronyms like "NMRI" early in the text for clarity. Figures and Tables: Add visual aids to summarize longitudinal data trends and improve engagement.	
Optional/General comments	The language is below the standard required for scholarly communication. Extensive editing for grammar, style, and clarity is necessary to ensure the manuscript meets academic publication standards.	

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hashim Mohamed Siraj
Department, University & Country	Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia