Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_69684**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Synthetic Advances against Coronaviruses: A Short Review of the Recent Literature on Various Synthetic Methods and Recently Developed Strategies**
Type of the Article	**Mini-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:

(http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Abstract** **Comment 1:** The abstract is a bit shallow. It is the first impression for the reader. As we know it must indicate the whole work in concise manner. Can you, please, give it depth? Please indicate the most important jobs done. **Introduction** **Comment 2:** Please add mechanism of actions of the synthetics/drugs in Part II. How do they affect viral physiology? In part 3 of the main text(The part that says: **Recent Strategies for the Development of Antiviral Drugs)**, you indicated the detailed mechanisms of actions of the drugs. I prefer if you could do the same for part 2(Include mechanism of actions of the drugs in this part). Indicating mechanism of actions is appreciated. (How/in what way do the mentioned drugs affect viral physiology?). Please include this for the drugs in part II.	**I would like to thank reviewer for his/her thorough and useful comments. I have already included this response in the revised text (in yellow lines). Accordingly, I have shown detailed (point to point) of our responses to each item of the reviewer's comments directly inside the manuscript. Based the comments from the reviewer, I just want to explain some important points which are:** **Comment 1:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed. **Comment 2:** First, I would like to agree with you in that adding mechanism of antiviral action to the compounds mentioned in the paper would increase their value and depth, but this thing is not accessible because these compounds were synthesized by medicinal chemists using synthetic organic chemistry and a variety of design tools & techniques to synthesize lead compounds and then search for their therapeutic properties, after that they confirmed and evaluated its biological activity against the human corona virus, which actually happened, as it was discovered that they prevented the reproduction human coronavirus in the laboratory. Because of their value, this data is quickly becoming an important part of the information base that medicinal chemists use to recommend compounds for further development. Here they have finished their work and now to ascertain their vital information and how they affect viral physiology, this needs a working team consisting of chemists, biologists and specialized scientists in molecular modelling, computational analysis, structure determination, drug metabolism, pharmacology, safety assessment and all aspects of informatics. What I was able to do since I am a medicinal chemist was try to link a relationship between chemical structure and activity, which is just guesswork and based on the rule that I have the ability to do so by linking information about and activity available and structural activity relationship (SAR) & this has already been added to the manuscript & I hope you like it. ***Note: In the part III, it was just a compilation of the strategies used, an attempt to compile them in one source, otherwise they need a teamwork to be accomplished as I mentioned earlier.***

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	**Title:** Very nice and valuable. But, the word "synthetic" may also be replaced by another best medical term. Replacing by another best medical/pharmaceutical term makes it more attractive. **Abstract** **Comment:** I do not agree with the statement in line 4. It says: "but none of these antivirals was found to have any significant effect on mortality." Do you have strong evidence for this statement? On one hand, the statement gives low value for the restless works the scientific community did and is doing. On the other hand it contradicts the scientific fact. I think you need to make it clearer. Please convince your audience. **Introduction:** **Comment 1:** In paragraph 2 line 3-5: look the following statement: "In addition to 2019-nCoV, two coronaviruses have caused significant outbreaks of infection: severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) and Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS)." Rearranging the statement is good for the reader. May be, you can say: " Previously, two coronaviruses: severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) and Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS) have caused significant outbreaks of infection... Now 2019-nCoV..... This sequential indication is more attractive. **Comment 2:** In paragraph 2 line 20. The abbreviation "FDA" is not indicated in the abbreviations section. Also should be defined in the text as it is used for the first time. **Comment 3:** In paragraph 2 line 23: The second "Remdesivir" should be replaced by another phrase. Eg: 'This drug..". **Comment 4:** The following statement is found in the paragraph before figure 5: "The obtained compounds were evaluated for their antiviral activity and found to inhibit many types of coronaviruses". See the highlighted word. It is more general. Throughout the paper, you said inhibits(generally) the virus. But it is good if you indicate the mechanism of action of inhibition of viral physiology. This will give depth for the paper, and so, suitable for publication on this journal. **Conclusion** **Comment 5:** It is better if you rearrange the first two statements of the abstract. Eg: "Antivirals are one of the most important medications for mankind. Therefore, they need to be developed urgently....." **Abbreviations part:** **Comment 6:** I can't get the phrase "human immune deficiency virus" in the text. I got it in the references. It need not be included in the abbreviations part.	✓ **A bout the Title:** Suggested revision has been performed & was added in the title. ✓ **A bout the Abstract** I thank the reviewer for this comment & agree with him. Suggested revision has been performed & was added in the indicated lines. **Introduction:** **Comment 1:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed & was added in the indicated lines. **Comment 2:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed & was added in the indicated lines. **Comment 3:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed & was added in the indicated lines. **Comment 4:** ✓ I changed the word to be more clear and tried to relate it chemically because it is difficult to predict the mechanism as I have mentioned earlier. **Comment 5:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed & was added in the indicated lines. **Comment 6:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed & was added in the indicated lines.
Optional/General comments	Generally, the area that the authors look is very good. Their attention is on the synthetic advances against our contemporary enemy. As a scholar, I have great value for that. But giving depth for the work will make the work more smarter. Therefore, I recommend them to add mechanism of action of the drugs(How they affect viral physiology). This should specifically be done in part 2 of the main manuscript.	✓ **I very much appreciate this encouraging comment &** I would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere thanks to the reviewer who identified areas of our manuscript that needed corrections. First, I would like to agree with you that adding this part to the compounds mentioned in the paper would increase their value and depth, but this thing is not accessible because these compounds were synthesized by medicinal chemists using synthetic organic chemistry and a variety of design tools And techniques to manufacture lead compounds and then search for their therapeutic properties, after that they confirmed and evaluated its biological activity against the human corona virus,

		which actually happened, as it was discovered that they prevented the reproduction human coronavirus in the laboratory. Because of their value, this data is quickly becoming an important part of the information base that medicinal chemists use to recommend compounds for further development, here they have finished their work and now to ascertain their vital information and how they affect viral physiology, this needs a working team consisting of chemists, biologists and specialized scientists in molecular modelling, computational analysis, structure determination, drug metabolism, pharmacology, safety assessment and all aspects of informatics. What I was able to do since i am a medicinal chemist was try to link a relationship between chemical structure and activity, which is just guesswork and based on the rule that I have the ability to do so by linking information about and activity available and structural activity relationship (SAR) & this has already been added to the manuscript and I hope you like it.

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)*	