

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75445
Title of the Manuscript:	Prediction of mortality and mechanical ventilation among critically ill patients of COVID-19 infection
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<p>Methods: Insert study period (when was data refer) and pandemic data information at study local; There is no description about data analysis: add informations about it; Review presentation of results in tables and figures; This information about criterias of qSOFA and CORADS can be at methods.</p> <p>Discussion: At the last paragraph, insert the study's limitations and strengths.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title: I suggest - Mortality and mechanical ventilation among critically ill patients of COVID-19 infection: a cross-sectional study.</p> <p>Introduction: remove fig1, because doesn't add to the information</p> <p>Results: Remove Fig2, because these informations are at table 1. Put % at table 2. Change the figures 3,4, 5, 6 and 7 and describe it using a table</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Strongly descriptive study that describes the prevalence of risk factors undergoing mechanical ventilation in the ICU. The work lacks a description of the data analysis and a more robust statistical analysis, which would contribute to the deepening of the results presented. In the discussion, it is necessary to present the limitations, strengths and what the study adds to the knowledge.</p> <p>So, I suggest</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Andreza Duarte Farias
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal De Campina Grande, Brasil