

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_119149</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Fiberoptic Bronchoscopy in Non-Resolving Pneumonia: Insights from a Case Series Emphasizing Diagnostic Value and Treatment Implications"</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>1. Importance for Scientific Community:</b></p> <p>The manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides practical insights into the application of FOB and CT-guided FNAC in diagnosing non-resolving pneumonia. The detailed case studies help illustrate the clinical utility of these diagnostic tools.</p> <p><b>2. Title Suitability:</b></p> <p>The title is appropriate and clearly reflects the content of the manuscript. However, it could be more concise: "Diagnostic Value of Fiberoptic Bronchoscopy in Non-Resolving Pneumonia: Case Series and Implications".</p> <p><b>3. Abstract Comprehensiveness:</b></p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but could be more succinct. Consider summarizing the key findings and their implications in fewer sentences.</p> <p><b>4. Subsections and Structure:</b></p> <p>The structure is logical and the subsections are appropriate. Each case is clearly delineated, and the discussion ties the cases together effectively.</p> <p><b>5. Scientific Correctness:</b></p> <p>The manuscript appears scientifically sound. The use of FOB and CT-guided FNAC in the cases is well-documented and supported by relevant references.</p> <p><b>6. References:</b></p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent. They support the manuscript's claims and provide a solid foundation for the discussion.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication but there are grammatical errors and awkward phrasings. For example, in the introduction: "This makes patient selection and the timing of further evaluation difficult." could be rephrased for clarity.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>1. Figures and Tables:</b></p> <p>Ensure all figures and tables are of high quality and properly labelled. Figure legends should be clear and descriptive.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>This manuscript addresses an important clinical challenge: the diagnosis and management of non-resolving pneumonia. The authors present three case studies to underscore the diagnostic value of fiberoptic bronchoscopy (FOB) and CT-guided fine needle aspiration cytology (FNAC). The manuscript is generally well-structured and the case studies are detailed, providing valuable insights into the diagnostic processes for non-resolving pneumonia.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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>Girma Birhanu Tuka</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bule Hora University, Ethiopia</b>