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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear authors, The paper represents the review article which is focused on the interplay between ischemic and hemorrhagic risk scores. The article is written with the acceptable English-speaking adduction of the arguments. The article is sufficiently novel and very interesting to warrant publication. All the key elements are presented and described clearly. The most discussable options in the article are: 1. Would you please kindly correct all your typos and grammar errors throughout the manuscript. 2. It looks like a systematic review. Please provide a reader with the objective and limitations. The Methods might be elaborated on. 3. Please reorganize your final paragraph with the separated summary and Conclusion. You have a pretty good Systematic review, and I would recommend you provide more relevant information.