



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_64130
Title of the Manuscript:	Survival and Biomarkers of COVID-19 Patients Treated with remdesivir and Favipiravir in ICU during the Peak of Pandemic: A Single Center Study in Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In this original paper, the authors studied the efficacy of favipiravir and remdesivir treatment in COVID-19 patients and they allocated some lab tests as biomarkers to monitor the therapeutic outcomes. Despite the importance and novelty of this study, unfortunately, in my personal opinion-this paper needs substantial revision and is not acceptable for publication in this journal in this present form. The English language is not in a sufficient quality. There are numerous mistakes and used inappropriate words or collocations and grammar that I am bereft of time to list them all. For example, a bunch of COVID-19 (page 1 line 9), during the study period (page 1 line 18,19), 3% to 7%% (page 2 line 18), ^Commonest (page 2 line 21), and COVIC-19 (page 3 line 29). 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Write the first letter of remdesivir in capital (Remdesivir) <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The first three lines need to be revised. What does it mean by “mean of means”? page 1 line 20 The last paragraph which represents the conclusion needs to be revised, authors should clearly convey the message of their study. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The first sentence is confusing and it requires to be revised. There is no citation in the first paragraph of introduction. The introduction is not strong enough. It is better to mention the importance of biomarkers and the drugs. For example, how biomarkers can help the therapeutic or diagnostic outcomes in COVID-19 patients. Generally, in introduction, it is better to do not use phrases like (studies showed and one of the Chinese cohort studies) First mention the full names of HFNC, NIV, and others, then use the abbreviation forms. It would be good to introduce convalescent plasma therapy. <p>Methodology and Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Revised the sentence presenting the inclusion criteria, page 3 line 27 	



	<p>2. Sentence in page 3 line 30 and 31 is incomplete.</p> <p>3. How this study evaluated the efficacy of the treatment? There is no supportive post-treatment evidence, such as RT-PCR, CT scan, and laboratory tests to measure whether the treatment was viable or not. As well as, pro-inflammatory cytokines and chemokines, including IL-1β, IL-2, IL-6, IL-8, both IFN-α/β, TNF, CCL2-5, and IP-10. These cytokines play a pivotal role to determine the efficacy of the drugs.</p> <p>Figure legend:</p> <p>1. Caption to describe figure 1 is missing.</p> <p>Table:</p> <p>1 There is no need to use “The t-value is” in the table the column just indicates that. Delete “The t-value is” within all tables.</p> <p>2 Why authors did not provide the t-value for all tests.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>1 The phrase “one of the bigger” is not appropriate in this section. Page 5 line 22</p> <p>2 Name of Authors needs to be italic (<i>Yang et al.</i>).</p> <p>3 Other important studies concerning favipiravir and remdesivir-based treatment should be discussed and be compared with this current study.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>1 The study did not measure the SpO2 in patients why in conclusion authors mentioned the SpO2.</p> <p>2 Conclusion is not strong because a conclusion conveys the overall message or results of a study; here, the authors should conclude that which biomarkers or treatment were beneficial for COVID-19 patients.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>1 The reference format is not appropriate, it is better the authors use reference manager software like EndNote.</p>	
<p>General comments</p>	<p>Abbreviations were not used appropriately throughout the manuscript.</p>	



SDI 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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Sadeqi Nezhad
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran