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:

Review Form 1.6

(http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

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	**Nomenclature in the text shall be used as it is widely accepted in current literature: "SARS-CoV-2" instead of "2019-nCoV"** **The Conclusions are too generalizing and vague, they are not directly rooted in the material presented in the article.** **The title in the part "...synthetic methods..." needs to be modified for clarification: I assume that e.c. "...newly synthetized potential drugs..." would be better.**	**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:** ✓ I thank the reviewer for this comment. The conclusion has been rewritten. **Comment 3:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed.
Minor REVISION comments	**There is no sections clearly delineated like Material and methods, the Results and Discussion - which blurs the structure of the manuscript.** **The methods used by the Authors to determine and choose the literature and referred to in the manuscript, were not clearly defined by the Authors in the text - so the Readers cannot verify the accuracy of the material selection the Authors made.** **The aims of the manuscript shall be explained not only in the Abstract but also in the main text of the manuscript.**	**Comment 1:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed. **Comment 2:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed. **Comment 3:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed and added at the end of the introduction.
Optional/General comments	**I actually am lost in judging who the targeted Reader of this article is as:** - **It is obviously designed as a review article but the number of references is too scarce for even a short review article on such a vast subject, especially that some parts of the text refer to several sources at once.** - **The article does not address directly clinically useful information, as the substances mentioned in the text are not allowed to be used on patients yet. On the other hand, the article's depth level of provided detail is too low for scientists who make syntheses of new drugs in the labs and are declared as the text's target. The high school and university students won't benefit from this review either as the material covered does not fit into their current study curricula.** **The Authors need to clarify who their desired target Reader is and fit the contents of the article, its structure and level of thoroughness to this desired target.**	I thank the reviewer for this comment. I would like to clarify the following: ✓ As for the number of references, even a few days before the paper was submitted to this journal, I was looking for new articles on the synthesis of new derivatives against COVID-19, and despite the topic's importance, I didn't find any new references other than the available refernces I based on them in writing this paper so this is out of my hands. ✓ I already identified the desired benefit from this paper in the

		summary, which states: “The review aims to provide a starting point for medicinal chemists to synthesize necessary and effective drugs against coronaviruses". This gives a clear benefit to any medicinal chemist who wants to start synthesizing effective derivatives against COVID-19. He can start from these derivatives, trying to develop them and introduce them to advanced clinical stages so as not to waste time when we all need a quick solution to this disease. However, I also ADDED that in the end of introduction and conclusion to make it clearer.

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)*	