

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_101346
Title of the Manuscript:	Recurrent SRAS-CoV-2 infections during the COVID19 pandemic in Saudi Arabia
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Somehow the manuscripts give evidence for the probability of COVID-19 re-infection; however, the sample size is limited and the pandemic era is almost over, and may have a negative impact on the impact of the vaccine. The title needs some modification (is it prevalence, occurrence rate, or incidence?) The abstract is too shallow. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The problem and the degree of severity of re-infection should be elaborated. Methodology: rewrite to Methods And from the method part, the study design and sampling technique should be well stated. In the Results section, known symptoms of COVID-19 are stated and how we can consider them as a result. Rather than what I expected from the overall suspected cases, this much participation has been confirmed to have COVID-19 re-infection. The severity of the second or third round of infection was, on average, mild. So the result needs modification. Conclusions: How does the author generalise that "infection with COVID-19 does not provide life-long protection" with only 10 cases? Were the study populations healthcare workers? Throughout the manuscript, there is a description of healthcare workers as highly vulnerable. If not, what is the evidence of the authors? The structure of the manuscript is good, but it still needs some detail and additional information about <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study participants eligibility criteria Sample collection and processing Written consent form. From the discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limitations of the study. Source of budget. Authors contribution. Conclusions and recommendations are needed. Manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes; with the above modifications Are the references sufficient and recent? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have no doubt about the number of references but from the introduction the first paragraph should cited. The reference should be written accordingly the journal and never be hyperlinked. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There are some grammatical errors and inconsistency while writing COVID-19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author should revise the manuscript. 	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The study should consider the overall confounders for COVID-19 re-infection rather than generalising.2. The discussion should be inline and limited to the study findings, other than narrating all the general truths and talks about COVID-19.3. It may have also had a negative perception of the vaccine for COVID-19. If the re-infection is common.	
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Dagninet Alelign Emiru
Department, University & Country	Arba Minch University, Ethiopia