

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JPRI_125098 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The Silent Struggle: Addressing Post-COVID Health Challenges with Booster Doses |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|--|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This study is important for determining whether booster doses can reduce post-COVID health complications that many people experience after recovery. Its findings can inform vaccine policy, improve patient care, and help ease the burden on healthcare systems dealing with long-term COVID-19 effects. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | It could be more clear and precise, like <i>Evaluating the Role of Booster Doses in Mitigating Post-COVID Health Issues</i> or <i>The Effect of Booster Doses on Post-COVID Health Outcomes</i> | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Yes, it is, but the results section could be more detailed, while the conclusion should be more direct and concise. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes | |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically and technically sound. It has a clear methodology, well-defined objectives, and in-depth data analysis. The authors effectively review relevant literature and clearly present their findings, contributing valuable insights to the field. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Yes, they are sufficient and recent. | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | In a few instances, spelling and grammar require revision. | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | The discussion section should be more comprehensive and detailed. | |

Review Form 3

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Manvi Gupta |
| Department, University & Country | Sardar Patel Post Graduate Institute of Dental & Medical Sciences, India |