

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76013
Title of the Manuscript:	TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED BREATHING EXERCISES AMONG CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE PATIENTS.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Comment 1: It is good if the authors correct the following statements. The statements repeat the idea. One of the two statements is not necessary. Already the third largest..... will become the third largest...?</p> <p>"Mortality rate of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) is more than 3 million people every year, making it 3rd largest cause of death in the world. It has been estimated that by the year 2030 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease will become the third biggest cause of death."</p> <p>Comment: Did you take written consent from the patients? If yes, why not indicated in the methods part? If no, questions will be raised on the work</p> <p>Comment: I can't see tables and/or figures that indicate the findings. I think readers want these. Could you include?</p> <p>Comment: The way the authors wrote the discussion is very good. But, it is very short. Further discussion is necessary.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Comment: "Distribution of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease patients with regards to demographic variables." The above part of the result is put by listing the findings. I don't think this is the usual way. It is better to put as a paragraph.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The study is very good. It is practical study. It is very nice study. The introduction, method, and result are good. But further discussion is needed.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Yohannes Markos Woldesenbet</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia</i>