

[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 <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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the long-term management of cerebral small vessel disease (CSVD) with a focus on geriatric care. Its unique contribution lies in its longitudinal study design spanning 10 years, highlighting the integration of physiotherapy with pharmacological treatments. Such a comprehensive approach is crucial for addressing neurodegenerative conditions prevalent in ageing populations. By emphasising holistic interventions, this study contributes significantly to geriatric neurology and rehabilitation sciences.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the study's content, focusing on CSVD over a 10-year period. However, for clarity, a more specific title could be: <i>"Cerebral Small Vessel Disease: A 10-Year Longitudinal Study on Geriatric Intervention and Outcomes"</i> .	
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 is generally comprehensive but lacks specific details about the study's methodology and key findings. I recommend adding a brief mention of the physiotherapy regimen, the improvements observed (e.g., reduction in NPRS and improved ADL scores), and the significance of the Fazekas scale outcomes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, with a logical progression from the introduction to methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. However, the clinical prognosis and results section would benefit from more distinct subsections, such as "Clinical Findings," "Functional Outcomes," and "Implications."	
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 demonstrates scientific robustness through its longitudinal design, evidence-based interventions, and comprehensive analysis of functional outcomes. The incorporation of physiotherapy, alongside standard pharmacological treatment, exemplifies an integrative approach to CSVD management. The use of validated scales like NPRS and Fazekas strengthens the reliability of the findings. However, the absence of updated imaging results in the latter years of the study slightly limits the longitudinal analysis's depth.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are recent and relevant, with many derived from reputable journals. However, the inclusion of more recent studies, such as those published post-2020, would enhance the manuscript's currency. Suggested additions include: Rensma et al., 2022. <i>Advances in Cerebral Small Vessel Disease Management</i> . Hooper et al., 2023. <i>Multimodal Interventions for Stroke and Neurodegeneration</i> .	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	While the language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, there are grammatical inconsistencies and redundancies. For example, the sentence "A holistic intervention, including regular physiotherapy can do a larger extent can minimize progression" requires rephrasing for clarity and accuracy. Proofreading is recommended.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript could benefit from a dedicated section discussing potential applications of its findings to broader clinical practice. For instance, a subsection on how similar physiotherapeutic interventions could be tailored for other neurodegenerative disorders would add value.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jonathan Sabarre
Department, University & Country	Newcastle University, United Kingdom