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	I have gone through entire mini review, based on my assumption that authors were collected material & done good work. There are some correction has to do. 1. In page No 5, not able to understand what it means? Lost 3 lines have to modify. 2. I suggest authors that already antiviral drugs are not effective against SARS CoV – virus, new molecule up to which level will be effective can't predict. 3 .I request authors to modify & rewrite full references. By doing these corrections, it may be consider.	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:** ✓ If you mean the 3 last line in page 5 which are" The strongest compound was N-(2-methyl-8-tert-butyl-3-oxo-1-thia-4-azaspiro[4.5]decan-4-yl)-3-phenyl propanamide (Fig. 3), which had an EC_{50} value of 5.5 μM)" . It showed the chemical name of the most active compound in the selected article with its EC_{50} (represents the concentration of a compound where 50% of its maximal effect is observed). **Comment 2:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed. 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. **Comment 3:** ✓ Suggested revision has been performed.
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)*	