

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_116928
Title of the Manuscript:	NEWER ORAL ANTIVIRAL FOR THE TREATMENT OF COVID-19 INFECTION
Type of the Article	Review 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall, while the manuscript addresses an important topic, it requires significant revisions to enhance its originality, depth, contextualization, critical analysis, and forward-looking perspective. These improvements are essential to ensure the manuscript's relevance and contribution to the existing literature on COVID-19 therapeutics. 2. Yes 3. No 4. No 5. Yes 6. No 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, there are several mistakes in each section. For instance, after starting the new sentence, the author needs to put a space after the first word.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of Novel Contribution: While the manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of orally effective treatments for COVID-19, it does not offer significant novel insights or perspectives beyond summarizing existing knowledge. Given the abundance of review articles on this topic, the manuscript needs to demonstrate a unique contribution, such as synthesizing recent research findings, proposing novel hypotheses, or offering critical analysis to advance the field. 2. Limited Scope and Depth: The review provides a broad overview of oral antiviral medications for COVID-19 treatment but lacks depth in several key areas. For instance, it could benefit from a more thorough examination of the mechanisms of action, pharmacokinetics, and clinical trial data of the discussed drugs. Additionally, exploring comparative efficacy, safety profiles, and challenges in real-world implementation would enhance the manuscript's depth and relevance. 3. Insufficient Contextualization: While the manuscript briefly discusses the FDA authorization and approval of certain oral antiviral drugs, it does not sufficiently contextualize these developments within the broader landscape of COVID-19 therapeutics. Providing a comprehensive overview of available treatment options, including monoclonal antibodies and other investigational therapies, along with discussing evolving treatment guidelines and global healthcare policies, would enhance the manuscript's context and relevance. 4. Lack of Critical Analysis: The manuscript presents the potential benefits of oral antiviral medications for COVID-19 treatment without critically evaluating the quality of evidence, limitations of current therapies, or implications for clinical practice and public health. Including a critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of oral antivirals, along with discussions on factors influencing treatment decisions, implementation challenges, and equity considerations, would improve the manuscript's credibility and usefulness to readers. 5. Need for Future Directions: While the manuscript briefly mentions the challenges posed by emerging variants and the likelihood of continued COVID-19 infections, it does not offer 	

Review Form 1.7

	substantive discussions on future directions in oral antiviral drug development or research priorities. Incorporating insights into potential areas for innovation, collaboration, and policy implications would enrich the manuscript and make it more forward-looking.	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

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:	Soheil Haddadzadegan
Department, University & Country	University of Innsbruck, Austria