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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

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		Should write his/her reedback here)
	Abstract	
	Comment 1: The abstract is a bit shallow. It is the first impression for the reader. As we know it must indicate the whole work in concise manner. Can you, please, give it depth? Please indicate the most important jobs done.	
	Introduction Comment 2: Please add mechanism of actions of the synthetics/drugs in Part II. How do they affect viral physiology? In part 3 of the main text(The part that says: Recent Strategies for the Development of Antiviral Drugs), you indicated the detailed mechanisms of actions of the drugs. I prefer if you could do the same for part 2(Include mechanism of actions of the drugs in this part). Indicating mechanism of actions is appreciated. (How/in what way do the mentioned drugs affect viral physiology?). Please include this for the drugs in part II.	
Minor REVISION comments		
	Title: Very nice and valuable. But, the word "synthetic" may also be replaced by another best medical term. Replacing by another best medical/pharmaceutical term makes it more attractive. Abstract	
	Comment: I do not agree with the statement in line 4. It says: "but none of these antivirals was found to have any significant effect on mortality." Do you have strong evidence for this statement? On one hand, the statement gives low value for the restless works the scientific community did and is doing. On the other hand it contradicts the scientific fact. I think you need to make it clearer. Please convince your audience.	
	Introduction: Comment 1: In paragraph 2 line 3-5: look the following statement: "In addition to 2019-nCoV, two coronaviruses have caused significant outbreaks of infection: severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) and Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS)." Rearranging the statement is good for the reader. May be, you can say: "Previously, two coronaviruses: severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) and Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS) have caused significant outbreaks of infection Now 2019-nCoV This sequential indication is more attractive.	
	Comment 2: In paragraph 2 line 20. The abbreviation "FDA" is not indicated in the abbreviations section. Also should be defined in the text as it is used for the first time. Comment 3: In paragraph 2 line 23: The second "Remdesivir" should be replaced by another phrase. Eg: 'This drug". Comment 4: The following statement is found in the paragraph before figure 5: "The obtained compounds were evaluated for their antiviral activity and found to inhibit many types of coronaviruses". See the highlighted word. It is more general. Throughout the paper, you said inhibits(generally) the virus. But it is good if you indicate the mechanism of action of inhibition of viral physiology. This will give depth for the paper, and so, suitable for publication on this journal.	
	Conclusion Comment 5: It is better if you rearrange the first two statements of the abstract. Eg: "Antivirals are one of the most important medications for mankind. Therefore, they need to be developed urgently" Abbreviations part: Comment 6: I can't get the phrase "human immune deficiency virus" in the text. I got it in the references. It need not be included in the abbreviations part.	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

Review Form 1.6

Generally, the area that the authors look is very good. Their attention is on the synthetic advances against our contemporary enemy. As a scholar, I have great value for that. But giving depth for the work will make the work more smarter. Therefore, I recommend them to add mechanism of action of the drugs(How they affect viral physiology). This should specifically be done in part 2 of the main manuscript.	
	1

PART 2:

		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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yohannes Markos Woldesenbet	
Department, University & Country	Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)