

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_130024
Title of the Manuscript:	Perfect the Puff: Reinforcing Metered-Dose Inhaler Excellence Amongst Primary Care Trainees
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it reflects the critical gap of training the primary care providers the use of MDI to improve users’ technique, which is an essential skill for managing chronic respiratory conditions such as Asthma and COPD. Thus, improving health care workers’ proficiency ultimately improves patient education, adherence and care, ultimately enhancing outcomes, decreasing exacerbations, uninvited hospital visitations and admissions. Furthermore, this adds to the growing evidence of effectiveness of targeted educational interventions in optimizing healthcare delivery and improving patient safety	The authors would like to thank the reviewer for this feedback.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable for the research, however, needs some modification as “perfect puff” is not limited to specifically for asthma management.....this is a broad term for MDI use/technique applicable for asthma, COPD, bronchiectasis to deliver optimal medication to the lungs. Since this research was targeted on Perfect puff training to assess efficacy of MDI use amongst trainee with asthma as the disease entity (body of the manuscript), it is worthwhile to consider rephrasing the title. Say “Perfect Puff: Perfect the Puff: Reinforcing Metered-Dose Inhaler Excellence Amongst Primary Care for optimal asthma management”	The authors would like to thank the reviewer for this feedback. The title has been changed to reflect your feedback.

Review Form 3

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Concisely written, however, the methods section fails to address - the type of study design, and - how the data were analysed.	The authors would like to thank the reviewer for this feedback. The following sentences was included under the Methods section to clarify the type of study design: “A qualitative study using open ended surveys via questionnaires was implemented to better assess residents knowledge of MDI technique.” Additionally, regarding how the data was analyzed, the information can be found under the header “Statistical Analysis” and is underlined for easy viewing.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, however, recommendations should not be limited to only digital learning, reinforcing excellence such as use of visual aids, hands on training, regular evaluation of trainees via audit and feedback. Also, consider qualitative feedback from the trainees to understand their perspectives on the training's effectiveness and any challenge that has persistent	The authors would like to thank the reviewer for this feedback. The following sentence was included in the last sentence of the discussion right before the conclusion: “Additionally, reinforcing excellence such as use of visual aids, hands on training, and regular evaluation of trainees via audit and feedback are other modalities that can be employed to encourage further reinforcement.” The following sentence was also included in the last sentence of the first paragraph in the Discussion section: “Additionally, qualitative feedback from trainees to understand their perspectives on the training's effectiveness and any challenges they may have faced was never collected and could have served as valuable information in medical education practice.”
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	The authors would like to thank the reviewer for this feedback.
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	The authors would like to thank the reviewer for this feedback.
Optional/General comments		

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)	The authors would like to thank the reviewer for this feedback.