

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_98998</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Intrapulmonary Use of Hydrogen Peroxide in Respiratory Obstruction: Initial Results Demonstrate the Possibility of Airway Recanalization and Blood Reoxygenation Through the Lungs. An Update</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short communication</b>

### 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>Concept is ok. Author want to use Hydrogen peroxide and sodium bicarbonate combination to relieve from hypoxia caused due to thick mucus &amp; sputum or blood . But conclusion based on experiments as written in final paragraph need ethical clearance which is not mentioned in manuscript</p> <p>yes</p> <p>It's a short communication</p> <p>Concept is well taken but conclusions are not correlated with reproducibility</p> <p>ok</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	ok	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Authors need to clarify and detail for ethical clearance of data mentioned about testing on rabbits . Methodolgy and interpretation need to be clarified .	

### 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)
<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>BalramJi Omar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>AIIMS, India</b>