

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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. Importance for the Scientific Community: This manuscript has the potential to be informative for the scientific community, especially healthcare professionals encountering pneumonia patients. It provides a general overview of the disease burden, risk factors, and causes of pneumonia. However, the focus on a "perspective" suggests a more opinion-based approach, which might limit its originality for research scientists. 2. Suitability of the Title: The current title, "Perspective of Pneumonia in the Health-Care Setting," is a bit vague. Here is alternative title suggestion that is more specific: Pneumonia in Healthcare Settings: A Comprehensive Overview of Epidemiology, Etiology, Diagnostic and Prevention Strategies 3. Comprehensiveness of the Abstract: The abstract provides a good general overview of pneumonia, including its prevalence, causes, and risk factors. However, it could be more comprehensive by mentioning: Specific types of pathogens causing pneumonia (e.g., common bacterial or viral strains) Diagnostic methods for identifying pneumonia (e.g., chest X-ray) Different treatment approaches based on the cause of pneumonia (e.g., antibiotics for bacteria) Additionally, consider mentioning the target audience for this manuscript in the introduction. Is it aimed at medical students, general practitioners, or specialists in pulmonary medicine? Include a brief mention of the purpose of the review article. Does it aim to update readers on recent advancements in pneumonia management, or focus on specific challenges faced in the healthcare setting? 4. Subsections: While the subsections are mostly appropriate, Section 6 (Types of Pneumonia) could be reorganized for better flow. Consider combining sections like "Community-Acquired Pneumonia" and "Healthcare-Associated Pneumonia" into one section on "Classification based on Acquisition Setting." 5. Scientific Correctness: Yes, the manuscript exhibiting a high level of scientific correctness, accurately summarizing current knowledge on pneumonia from epidemiological, pathophysiological, diagnostic, and therapeutic perspectives. 6. References: The reference list is extensive and includes recent publications. However, you might consider adding a few key references on: The latest pneumonia guidelines (e.g., from the American Thoracic Society or Infectious Diseases Society of America), Recent advancements in rapid diagnostics for pneumonia. 7. Additional Comments: The introduction could be strengthened by mentioning the target audience for this manuscript (e.g., general practitioners, pulmonologists, infectious disease specialists). Consider adding a brief statement about the limitations of pneumonia management in the healthcare setting (e.g., antibiotic resistance, resource limitations). Overall, this is a strong review article that will be a valuable resource for healthcare professionals. By addressing the minor suggestions above, the authors can further enhance the clarity and impact of their work 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The text exhibits a commendable proficiency in English language usage, yet several areas warrant refinement to bolster clarity and precision:</p> <p>Consistency in Terminology: Ensuring uniformity in terminology usage throughout the article, particularly evident in the "Prevention" section where "methods" and "tactics" are interchangeably employed to depict preventive measures.</p> <p>Sentence Structure: Addressing lengthy and convoluted sentences, particularly in the "Methods to Prevent the Spread of Infections" section, could augment readability and comprehension. Dividing such sentences into shorter, more succinct ones is advised.</p> <p>Word Choice and Redundancy: Reducing redundant phrases and opting for more precise wording, as exemplified in the "Conclusion" section where "continues to be a major issue" could be substituted with "remains a significant concern" for improved precision.</p> <p>Transition Phrases: Introducing transition phrases to facilitate smoother transitions between sections and paragraphs aids in guiding readers through the logical flow of ideas. Phrases like "Furthermore," "In addition," or "However," contribute to coherence.</p>	
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:	Om Parkash
Department, University & Country	Chandka Medical College, Pakistan