

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_118298
Title of the Manuscript:	Perspective of Pneumonia in the Health-Care Setting
Type of the Article	Review 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript addresses an important topic within the scientific community as it provides comprehensive information on pneumonia, including its epidemiology, pathophysiology, diagnosis, prevention, and management strategies. Given the significant impact of pneumonia on public health and healthcare systems worldwide, this manuscript offers valuable insights for researchers, healthcare professionals, and policymakers aiming to understand, prevent, and manage this respiratory infection effectively. 2. The title of the article, "Comprehensive Overview of Pneumonia: Epidemiology, Pathophysiology, Diagnosis, Prevention, and Management Strategies," is suitable as it accurately reflects the scope and content of the manuscript. It effectively communicates the comprehensive nature of the information provided. 3. The abstract of the article appears to be comprehensive, summarizing key aspects of pneumonia, including its epidemiology, pathophysiology, diagnosis, prevention, and management strategies. However, it could be improved by providing more specific details about the findings and implications discussed in the manuscript. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate, covering various aspects of pneumonia in a systematic manner. However, the text could benefit from clearer delineation of subsections to improve readability and facilitate navigation for readers. 5. Overall, the manuscript appears scientifically correct, presenting information based on established research findings, clinical guidelines, and epidemiological data. However, ensuring the accuracy of specific details and referencing primary sources for complex topics would enhance scientific rigor. 6. While the references provided are sufficient, including recent studies and guidelines, there may be an opportunity to incorporate additional references to further support specific points and provide readers with access to the latest research in pneumonia epidemiology, pathophysiology, diagnosis, prevention, and management. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are areas where improvement could enhance clarity and readability. This includes ensuring consistent use of terminology, maintaining a formal tone throughout, and addressing any grammatical errors or awkward phrasing. Additionally, clear and concise writing style will aid in effectively conveying complex concepts to the intended audience. Overall, while the language quality is acceptable, further attention to detail and refinement may improve the article's suitability for scholarly communication. There are areas where clarity and organization could be improved, such as subsection headings and language consistency.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dheiver Francsico Santos
Department, University & Country	Brazil