## 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 | **Well written article. But a few points merit attention.**<br>**1. The title needs to be reviewed a little because the use of the word "synthetics" is very generic. It needs to be made more specific for instance synthetic antiviral agents" or something which elaborates the word synthetic.**<br>**2. The reader by the time he reaches the ending part of the article should have a clear-cut and concise take home message. The conclusion is okay but a short enumeration of the synthetics agents may be added.**<br>**3. The most vital aspect of any publication is its abstract. A well written abstract immediately captivates the attention of the Reader. It is a mere suggestion that the abstract may be improvised a little. Subheadings of Introduction, New developments and conclusion may be done. Obviously it needs to be crisp and concise.**<br><br>**However, keeping its relevant discussion of novel concepts in the treatment of coronavirus, the article should be accepted for publication.** | 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:<br>**Comment 1:**<br>✓ Suggested revision has been performed & was added in the indicated lines.<br>**Comment 2:**<br>✓ Suggested revision has been performed & was added in the indicated lines.<br>**Comment 3:**<br>✓ Suggested revision has been performed & was added in the indicated lines. |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | **Length may be reduced a little.** | After the other reviewers comments I did not able to reduce the length. |
| **Optional/General** comments | **Well written article.**<br>**Relevant in today's scenario.**<br>**With the few improvisations suggested, it should be accepted for publication.** | I very much appreciate the encouraging 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)* | |