

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_86696
Title of the Manuscript:	EXHALED BREATH SEMICONDUCTOR SENSORS FOR DIAGNOSTICS OF RESPIRATORY DISEASES
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: needs to be more directive in terms of what is the focus of the review. 2. Abstract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too short, very little information. If I were the reader, it does not attract me to read further. - It should, at least describe the main objective of the review; the methodology of the review, type of review; what was the findings of the review and make a conclusion based on the review objective. 3. Main text <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There was no clear problem statement to support the conduct of the review. - The introduction did not highlight why the review is important. - There was not statement of the purpose of the review, and the methodology of the review or at least describe how the contents were being organized. - The overall content of the manuscript was very descriptive; attempting to list all the available tools for diagnostic of respiratory diseases. - The conclusion is not clear; what is the message or any points on the implication to practice? 4. General comments: Some typo errors, here and there. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Maria Justine
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia