

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_72919
Title of the Manuscript:	FIGHTING COVID 19 WITH THE HELP OF ALKALINE DIET
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1 - The abstract is very short and uninformative, it does not describe the purpose of the study, techniques and methods used, it must be structured, that is, contain different subsections. I suggest it be rewritten.</p> <p>2 - The authors did not present the materials and methods section.</p> <p>3 - What is the purpose of this study? The last paragraph of the introduction should contain the objective of the study. I suggest the authors rewrite it.</p> <p>4 - Which databases were consulted to carry out this study? The authors do not describe any methodological outline. What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study? What was the search period for the articles used and what types of studies were used?</p> <p>5 - A fundamental requirement for the publication of systematic reviews is the presentation of the registration number of the study protocol deposited in PROSPERO, if the authors do not have it, they should use it on the link: <a href="https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/">https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/</a></p> <p>6 - Authors producing systematic reviews and meta-analyses should follow the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines (<a href="http://www.prisma-statement.org">http://www.prisma-statement.org</a>).</p> <p>7 - In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets.</p> <p>8 - The tables were formatted and described in a way that does not interest the reader. I suggest they be reviewed.</p> <p>9 - The authors did not present the results of the present study and there is no discussion.</p> <p>10 - The conclusion must respond to the objective of the study, however, the authors do not describe the objective of the study and therefore, the conclusion was meaningless.</p> <p>11 - I suggest that authors review the general guideline for authors for correction of references.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The article contains important methodological errors, so I suggest that the authors rewrite it and make a new submission.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The subject of the study is very interesting and relevant to the medical and scientific community, however need to review the text, contains many errors. The article needs to be revised, standards and general structure.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

## Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Elaine Cristina Martinez Teodoro</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University Center FUNVIC, Brazil</i>