



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_65260
Title of the Manuscript:	Has the Pandemic Triggered a 'Paperdemic'?: Towards an Assessment of Diagnostic Indicators for Covid-19
Type of the 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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>In the underlined research topic "<u>Has the Pandemic Triggered a 'Paperdemic'?: Towards an Assessment of Diagnostic Indicators for Covid-19</u>" is a novel part to the existing literature. The title of the article is remarkable, the presentation is good and the article may provide several scientific justifications. Below are several suggestions which will increase writer input to technical research and probability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The title should be "Has the Pandemic Triggered a 'Paperdemic'?: Towards an Assessment of Diagnostic Indicators for Covid-19" • This article needs careful proof reading to remove grammar mistakes. • The author was able to provide his readers a solid, clear and adequate justification of the problem. • The research has used a "Story telling" style to formulate and write the body of the research that makes it more interesting. • The study contains an important factor or outcome which is "the innovation" which is not only important but an essential element for any organization seeking to sustain. • Methodology of the paper is fit to data, and analysis done by the authors is according to the requirements of paper title. • The study indicates "the adoption of industrial production contributes to poverty reduction, increased firms' income and productivity etc". He is in consistent with same results or conclusions that proved by previous literature. • The results and discussion of the study is quiet lengthy despite the importance of the information but if possible to eliminate some of the secondary information that does not disturb the quality of the research flow. • My recommendations that the author needs more explanation about the limitation of the study and what are the future research. <p>Finally,It's a nice attempt,the topic is of interest and has a wide range of policy impenentations. Bases on the above mantioned comments, I suggest "revison" of the article for more praticability before "acceptance".</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muneeb Ahmad
Department, University & Country	Jiangxi University of Finance and Economics, China