

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_130699
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect Of Anuloma Viloma Pranayama In People With Decreased Lung Reserve Due To Covid-19: A Literature Review
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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.	A good approach as it is a valuable study regarding public health	Thanks for the comments
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes,suitable	Thanks for the comments
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.	Comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes based on IMRAD format	Thanks for the comments
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient	Ok
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments heading discussion should be there instead of findings in manuscript.		

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