

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_116855
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of educational intervention on inhaler technique of patients in Asian countries- A systematic review
Type of the Article	

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>)

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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, this manuscript is important, given the high prevalence of respiratory diseases like asthma and COPD in this region. • Title is suitable. • Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. • Subsections and structure of the manuscript seems appropriate overall, however providing more detailed subsections within the Results section, particularly to differentiate between the various findings of the included studies. • Yes, manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. • Yes, the references appear to support the content of the manuscript well, but suggestion to conduct a final check for recent studies that may have been overlooked. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are there any limitations or biases associated with the tool that should be addressed or discussed in the manuscript? ○ Is there any subgroup analysis that could provide insights into the effectiveness of inhaler technique interventions based on demographic factors, severity of disease, or other relevant variables? ○ Sensitivity analysis could be conducted to assess the robustness of the findings to different methodological choices or inclusion criteria? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The abstract could be slightly more concise by avoiding repetition of certain phrases. eg. The phrase "The outcome regarding inhalation technique was reviewed and summarized" is repeated in the background and methodology sections.</p> <p>Specificity in Results: Abstract mentions the number of studies reviewed and their outcomes in general terms, adding specific findings or trends identified in the results section could enhance the reader's understanding. Providing a brief summary of the main results, such as the percentage of studies showing improvement in inhaler technique, could make the abstract more informative.</p> <p>The conclusion in the abstract is clear in stating that educational interventions were effective, but it could be strengthened by mentioning the implications of these findings or suggesting future research directions.</p>	
<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:	Ravi Kumar
Department, University & Country	SRMS Institute of Medical sciences, India