

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 <i>(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)</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>Nomenclature in the text shall be used as it is widely accepted in current literature: "SARS-CoV-2" instead of "2019-nCoV"</p> <p>The Conclusions are too generalizing and vague, they are not directly rooted in the material presented in the article.</p> <p>The title in the part "...synthetic methods..." needs to be modified for clarification: I assume that e.c. "...newly synthesized potential drugs..." would be better.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>There is no sections clearly delineated like Material and methods, the Results and Discussion - which blurs the structure of the manuscript.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The aims of the manuscript shall be explained not only in the Abstract but also in the main text of the manuscript.</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>I actually am lost in judging who the targeted Reader of this article is as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. <p>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.</p> | |
| | | |

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Robert Susło |
| Department, University & Country | Wrocław Medical University, Poland |