

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_98812
Title of the Manuscript:	Predictors of Death for Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19 in the First Year of the Pandemic in Northern Brazil - A Retrospective Study
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:

<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

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		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes. It does not add new information but supports existing information. Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Too much references. Some references seem irrelevant. At least 20 references can be removed.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Some suggestions to correct the content in table 1 and some grammatical errors, stated in the attached file.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Too much information on the introductory session. Could be improved by rewriting more concisely. Discussion session is too long and repeated.	

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:	Cho Mar Lwin
Department, University & Country	University of Medicine 1 Yangon, Myanmar