EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute
15 YEARS

Paper: **"Challenges in Managing an Ischemic Stroke in a Child with Homozygous SS Sickle Cell Disease Associated with Cerebral Palsy: A Case Report"**

Submitted: 01 November 2024
Accepted: 20 October 2025
Published: 30 November 2025

Corresponding Author: Muriel Amon Tanoh

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n33p59

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rozeta Shahinaj
Medical University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Anna Rekhviashvili
Tbilisi Medical Academy, Georgia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024*
This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Rozeta Shahinaj	
University/Country: Medical University of Tirana	
Date Manuscript Received: 18.11.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 25.11.2024
Manuscript Title: CHALLENGES IN MANAGING AN ISCHEMIC CEREBRAL VASCULAR STROKE IN A CHILD WITH A HOMOZYGOTE SS SICKLE CELL ASSOCIATED WITH CEREBRAL PALSY: A CASE STUDY	
ESJ Manuscript Number:1134	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: yes	

Evaluation Criteria:
Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) 1.The "A HOMOZYGOTE SS SICKLE CELL"is missing the word "disease" and "homozygote ss" is not the appropriate word. It is better to express" homozygous sickle cell disease" 2.The phrase "ISCHEMIC CEREBRAL VASCULAR STROKE" is more concise to be" ISCHEMIC CEREBRAL STROKE"	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) The abstract need to be organized : introduction, objective, case report and conclusion.	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) The phrase"due to a mutation in the 6th codon of the b-globin chain gene".the "b-globin" should be written as "β-globin" (using the Greek letter "β").	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) This is a case report, and the narrative is written in the past tense,explaining clearly the complication of the disease.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**5**
(Please insert your comments) In this case report, the authors discuss the challenges in managing the patient due to the healthcare policies of their country."	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) The conclusions are affirmative but lacks of suggestions for improving the care of patients with this disease.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) The references are appropriate for the article but need to be reorganized in APA format.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- The introduction could be expanded to include more detailed information about this disease, especially regarding the mechanisms by which it is complicated to cerebral ischemia and cerebral palsy. This would help to better contextualize the importance of the research question and its relevance to clinical practice.
- The phrase ”Sickle cell disease is a hemoglobin disease”.the word disease is repeated so it would be more accurate to say " Sickle cell disease is a hemoglobinopathy" ".
- The phrase"due to a mutation in the 6th codon of the b-globin chain gene".the "b-globin" should be written as "β-globin" (using the Greek letter "β").
- "common in patients of African and Caribbean origin":
- it would be better to use the word individuals instead of patients. Also this disease is seen in Mediterranean, Middle Eastern, and Indian population.

- "Children with sickle cell disease have a high risk of developing cerebrovascular complications such as ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke with a frequency of 14% before the age of 20." It’s clearer to use "prevalence" rather than "frequency."
- The phrase: “Observation”in the subheading, it is better to write ”Case report”
- The phrase "This is a child aged 5 years and 8 months" is correct but it is clearer to say "This is a 5-year and 8-month-old child".
- The phrase "not in school" is unclear. It would be more precise to say "not attending school".
- Overall the part of anamnesis would be more precise with explanations and shorter sentences to explain better the case report.
- The phrase "Biology revealed" is incorrect, use the medical terminology(Laboratory results)
- The treatment section needs to be more precise in explanation.
- Medication dosages and details need to be adjusted for clarity
- The discussion section is relatively brief, needs to reorganised a few sentences to make the medical terminology clearer.
- The conclusion section is affirmative and does not give any proposal on how to improve the care of this category of patients.
- The references need to be reorganized in APA format.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024*
This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Ann Rekhviashvili	
University/Country: Tbilisi Medical Academy / Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 14.11.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 24.11.2024
Manuscript Title: **CHALLENGES IN MANAGING AN ISCHEMIC CEREBRAL VASCULAR STROKE IN A CHILD WITH A HOMOZYGOTE SS SICKLE CELL ASSOCIATED WITH CEREBRAL PALSY: A CASE STUDY**	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:
Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	***Rating Result*** [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**3**
(Please insert your comments)It does not give information about mental retardation and epileptic seizures, which were confirmed in your patient.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	**2**
(Please insert your comments) It is a case report and more detailed information regarding the patient has to be given. Even in objectives, is mentioned a patient with stroke and mental retardation, but epilepsy and cerebral palsy is not even mentioned. Observation is also quite superficial and more detailed information regarding the patient would be beneficial. In discussion you mentioned stratification of the risk of stroke recurrence, which was not mentioned in objectives. In conclusion you mentioned "Management of a major sickle cell syndrome associated with neurovascular, epileptic, and cognitive impact in a child with sickle	

cell disease and cerebral palsy must comply with recent recommendations", hence in a title you are speaking about " **CHALLENGES IN MANAGING AN ISCHEMIC CEREBRAL VASCULAR STROKE"** in a patient with sickle cell disease.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	**4**
(Please insert your comments) Very minor	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**2**
(Please insert your comments) Study methods and their results are not discussed precisely and is written very superficially.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**3**
(Please insert your comments) Treatment results are discussed extremely superficial. There was no direct comparison of patient's condition on admission and improvement status.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2**
*(Please insert your comments) Epilepsy is not even mentioned! There is NOT given proper treatment recommendation. It gives us impression, like only one problem in treatment of this patient is "*delay and high cost of care".	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
(Please insert your comments)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is recommended to revise an article. The title has to depict the major ideas of text. The diagnostic and treatment challenges have to be written more clearly and in detailed way. Patients status before stroke and after is has to be clearly depicted and compared. What is mentioned in discussion, first of all has to be mentioned in results (i.e. measuring the average velocity in the arteries of the polygon of Willis using transcranial Doppler Ultrasound).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: