

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78708
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and imaging
Type of the Article	Systematic review

### 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 1.6**

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interesting theme or topic and in accordance with the scope of the journal</li><li>• Title: according to the purpose of writing the article.  Suggestion: the method can be added in the diagnostic title of Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome with Plain Chest Radiography and Computed Tomography Imaging</li><li>• Abstract: complete because it includes the background, purpose and contribution of writing the article</li><li>• Introduction: complete because it explains the state of the art of the ARDS problem. Suggestions added novelty from the writing of this article.</li><li>• Reviews of ARDS problems (causes, epidemiology, pathophysiology) and the importance of imaging (plain chest radiography, computed tomography) as well as literature review: good and complete supported by appropriate reference citations.  Suggestions can be added with figure or table of the results to make it easier for readers to understand them.</li><li>• Conclusion: according to the topic and purpose of writing the article.</li><li>• Reference: appropriate and updated and supports article reviews</li></ul>	<div>Amended revision</div> <div>Done</div> <div>Corrected</div> <div>Done</div>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Check for grammar errors (highlighted in yellow)</li></ul>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	manuscript is acceptable with minor revision	

**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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	