

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_109896
Title of the Manuscript:	Conducting Patient and Clinician Participatory Design Sessions to Create a User-Centered Mobile Application for Adults with Asthma
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. I have reviewed the manuscript 'Conducting Patient and Clinician Participatory Design Sessions to Create a User-Centered Mobile Application for Adults with Asthma', and it was interesting. The development of an application for self-monitoring of patients, especially those with bronchial asthma, is a significant step towards improving their quality of life. Involving patients and doctors in the design process can lead to a better understanding of their needs and ultimately result in a higher-quality product. Hence, the authors of this study have done a commendable job. However, I would like to suggest a minor change in the use of terms. Instead of using "Asthma education," I would recommend using "increasing awareness of patients with asthma" or "education of patients with asthma" to make the text more precise and clearer.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references provided are up-to-date and thorough.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olena Yelizarova
Department, University & Country	State Institution O.M. Marzиеv Institute for Public Health, National Academy of Medical Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine