

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3707
Title of the Manuscript:	Lenticulostriate Artery Aneurysm Presenting as Subarachnoid Haemorrhage
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b>comments</p>	<p>The article addresses an important issue by detailing a rare case of a lenticulostriate artery (LSA) aneurysm presenting with subarachnoid hemorrhage (SAH). However, the following points may be considered when making a critical assessment:</p> <p>### 1. <b>Consistency with Literature:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The article emphasizes the rarity of LSA aneurysms and their frequent association with intraparenchymal hemorrhage. It appears consistent with the references of other studies in the literature.</li><li>- However, the cited sources could be supported with more details and up-to-date information. For example, adding more case studies or meta-analyses could provide the reader with a broader perspective on the topic.</li></ul> <p>### 2. <b>Source Check:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The sources include other studies that specifically examine rare cases. However, some older sources may need to be supplemented, as well as more recent studies. For example, references from studies conducted after 2020 may be added.</li><li>- The accuracy of the sources should be checked; Each reference should be reviewed to ensure that it is properly verified and supports the information provided in the article.</li></ul> <p>### 3. <b>Completeness of Meaning:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The flow of the article is good in general, but some sections would benefit from more detail and explanation. For example, the "conservative management" section could explain in more detail what kind of supportive measures were taken.</li><li>- In the conclusion, the term "spontaneous regression" should be addressed more clearly; more information should be provided on how such a situation occurs and on the follow-up process.</li></ul> <p>### 4. <b>Additional Thoughts:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- As a case study, it would be useful to have more data on the patient's direct treatment results, and to detail the follow-up process. This could provide readers with more information on how to evaluate similar cases.</li></ul> <p>In conclusion, the article addresses an important topic and conveys knowledge at a certain academic level. However, it could provide richer content with the correction of current developments in the literature and typos.</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Necati Ucler</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gaziantep University, Turkiye</b>