

Review Form2

Book Name:	Science and Technology - Recent Updates and Future Prospects
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1842
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy Of Inhalation Instruction Using A New Real-Time Inspiratory Air Velocity Measuring Monitor
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study is regarding the Lungs where COPD is critical in assessing the capacity in terms of the volume of air that the lungs can hold. It is on respiratory system research & it is important.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, the title given is completely wrong as it shows it is a long, large, analytical experiment. In fact, it deals with only 6 subjects & their profile is also not given. The suggested title would be 'An Experiment on Efficacy of Inhalation Instruction on 6 Subjects'.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No, it is not at all comprehensive.The abstract will change as they have to write a section on the Research Methodology (RM). The sampling is 'Non Probability Sampling' category where 'Convinient' sampling is the sampling method. The research design is 'Experimental'. They have to also include the statistical analysis section in the abstract. In the end, they have to mention the superiority of the chosen equipment over others.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There is no RM section. One citation, the citation number 8 is Indian. Here, they have only cited the theory related particulate sizes but no application on air flow. They should have mentioned the experiment the authors did. They have to add sections on results also.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound?Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The authors have simply explained the process of using the equipment only. There is one sentence that says statistical significance is 5% & it also says the statistical significance is P<0.05. This shows the authors do not understand inferential statistics. The statistical significance in terms of sampling can be 0.01, 0.05 & 0.32. Here, it is not applicable as they have only 6 subjects which means they should mention the N as 6. What is the research indtrument for the subjects? What is the profile of the subjects? What is the pre experiment status & post experiment status of the subjects? There is no nomenclature as 'Collaborative' study in research. The type of research is only three which are descriptive, explorative & explanatory. There is no interpretation of the average, standard deviation& RD. They have to elaborate on these deviations. They have to mention what is the standard. Without the standard, how can you explain deviations? How many equipments were used? How many companies? What is the comparison? Currently, it seems they were completely biased on one equipment of a particular company.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	No, there are only 14 references.& the latest is of 2022. Search for the past as respiratory system is one of the widely researched area. Include new references from 2023 & half of 2024. Mention the latest edition of Davidson's principle & practice of medicine as a reference. Going through the internationally accepted medical book will give the authors a comprehensive understanding on the research area.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, there are areas of improvement. The authors need to frame better sentences in many sections.	
Optional/General comments	The process of chosing the 6 subjects has to be mentioned. The authors have to rewrite the heading, detail out the RM section, better the English of the sentences, increase & update the references, robust the design of the study to help it look like an experiment. Improve the inferential statistics or else the authors will have very few readers. Improvement has to be included before converting to a chapter.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tridibesh Tripathy
Department, University & Country	Lucknow University, India