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		
Minor REVISION comments	Comments in the attached manuscript	I would like to thank reviewers 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 (attached to the same email). Based the comments from the reviewer, I just want to explain ONE important point which is: 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 and I hope you like it.
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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)*	