

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 manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it introduces a novel method for improving inhalation instruction, vital for patients with respiratory conditions like asthma and COPD. Using the Tokico Inhalation Monitor (TIM), the study shows how real-time inhalation patterns can be visualized, potentially enhancing the effectiveness of inhalation therapy. I admire the manuscript's innovative approach and practical implications in clinical settings. However, I suggest that the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed exploration of long-term outcomes and a larger sample size for broader applicability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Efficacy Of Inhalation Instruction Using A New Real-Time Inspiratory Air Velocity Measuring Monitor" is appropriate as it conveys the main focus of the study. An alternative title could be "Enhancing Inhalation Therapy through Real-Time Monitoring of Inspiratory Airflow: A Study Using the Tokico Inhalation Monitor."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a comprehensive summary of the study's purpose, methods, and findings. However, it could be improved for clarity by including a clearer statement of the main conclusions and practical implications. Additionally, some sentences could be restructured for better readability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-organized with clear sections including Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, and Discussion.	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates a strong scientific foundation and technical validity. The study design is well-constructed, with a thorough validation of the TIM and a meticulous examination of its effectiveness. The use of statistical analysis to support the findings enhances the scientific rigor. Furthermore, the detailed explanation of the device configuration and validation process showcases a high level of technical competence and reliability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The cited references are adequate and encompass recent studies relevant to inhalation therapy and device validation. If additional references are required, it may be beneficial to include more recent studies on the clinical outcomes of using real-time monitoring devices in respiratory therapy.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article's language and English quality are suitable for scholarly communication, but the sentence structure could be improved for better clarity and readability.	
Optional/General comments	The study highlights a significant breakthrough in inhalation therapy. To further strengthen the evidence for the effectiveness of the TIM, future research could emphasize expanding to larger and more diverse populations while also focusing on long-term clinical outcomes.	

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:	Zainab Waheed
Department, University & Country	Kabir Medical College, Pakistan