

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79072
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPLICATION OF BUTEYKO BREATHING TECHNIQUE IN ASTHMATIC POPULATION: A LITERATURE REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The authors aimed to review different aspects linked to buteyko breathing technique in asthmatic population.</p> <p>The authors should improve the form of their manuscript starting from the abstract, as well as the contents, to make their work acceptable.</p> <p>In general, the main criticisms are: 1) lack of physiological basis as the background supporting the utilization of this breathing technique (see introduction), lack of data extracted regarding physiological bases and markers used to track its efficacy/utilization (see discussion), 2) methods sections should be rewritten, 3) results section is absent, 4) discussion or results section should present according to relevant aspects the extraction of information regarding the object of the review, 4) last but not least, your statements should be supported by evidence and references.</p>	<p>Since it is a review of literature there are no data extracted from the subjects or the particular techniques efficacy or the results were not mentioned. However as per the reviewers' suggestions method sections has been modified and supporting evidence has been added. Changed are highlighted in the manuscript</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Here minor comments referred to the text specifically.</p> <p>Abstract: Since this part is named/titled as background of your abstract you should avoid presenting already your results (i.e., how many studies you found and what they reported). Please define BTT since is the first time you use the term. Please consider reformulating your aim making it clearer. Rewrite these parts, consider using more polite terms instead of detractors. Mention the physiological bases that you were supposed to find (from your aims) to support you concluding statements.</p> <p>Introduction: Although the introduction reads well (respect to the abstract), it lacks few points: 1) you should explain what are the physiological bases behind the technique you are describing with appropriate references, and the markers linked to respiratory functions (e.g., ventilatory capacity or respiratory muscles strength). 2) before jumping to the methods you should mention your aims, hypothesis and/or objectives.</p> <p>Please consider rewriting appropriately the methods section, although this is not a systematic review you can find plenty of example of published reviews with more accurate methodological explanations. This looks schematic (too much). You can transfer it to an illustration or table or both and rewrite the chapter as text describing your methodological approach.</p> <p>There is not results section in which you should describe your findings and allocate according to the topics investigated or any relevant aspect.</p> <p>Discussion: please support your statements with adequate references, include physiological bases or extract data (if present) about it and markers used to analyse it. If not available such data you should state it and it will represent a big limit. Consequently manage your statements not only in the discussion but also conclusion section.</p>	<p>Changes are highlighted in the abstract . introduction, methods and discussion part as per the suggestion</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	No ethical issues