

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JPRI_69684   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Synthetic Advances against Coronaviruses: A Short Review of the Recent Literature on Various Synthetic Methods and Recently Developed Strategies</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Mini-Review Article</b>  |

### **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**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|--|--|--|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <p>Well written article. But a few points merit attention.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> <p>However, keeping its relevant discussion of novel concepts in the treatment of coronavirus, the article should be accepted for publication.</p> |  |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | Length may be reduced a little.  |  |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | <p>Well written article.<br/>                     Relevant in today's scenario.<br/>                     With the few improvisations suggested, it should be accepted for publication.</p>   |  |

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Amit Sharma</b>  |
| Department, University & Country | <b>National Institute of Tuberculosis and Respiratory Medicine (NITRD), India</b> |