

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77206
Title of the Manuscript:	Advanced collateral physiotherapy management for Pneumothorax following Dengue encephalitis: A case study
Type of the Article	Case study

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>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>From my point of view, the authors should attach the X-Ray images that were mentioned in the text. As well as showing the images before and after the physiotherapeutic intervention and pneumothorax drainage. The same reasoning should be for chest CT.</p> <p>In this paragraph: (To reduce work of breathing, body positioning were taught, breathing control exercises and relaxation technique were incorporated to the existing management. In order to improve ventilation, thoracic...) the authors could better specify which exercises were used within each mentioned technique.</p> <p>The authors did not mention how many days the patient had the intrathoracic tube and, after removing the tube, how much longer he continued undergoing Physiotherapy and what the radiological and clinical conditions were at this time.</p> <p>The 6MWT was included but the authors did not report data on the patient's Borg scale and vital signs during and after the test, as well as the interpretation of the test results.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Check some English erros.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors should have shown in this case study a more systematic evolution of the patient, showing the two weeks of hospitalization with the evolution of physiotherapy, radiological exams, and the actual performance of the walking test when it occurred and what was the patient's clinical condition in that first test and how was the evolution to the second test and after how long it was performed. This would allow the reader to have a better understanding of the patient's evolution and observe the effects of physiotherapy on his evolution. From the way the text is placed, it is not entirely clear what the real contribution of physiotherapy treatment is to the patient's improvement.</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:	Fernanda Figueiroa Sanchez Franco
Department, University & Country	UFAM -Federal University of Amazonas, Brazil