

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76230
Title of the Manuscript:	"Dietary Management During COVID-19 Pandemic"
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>I commend the author for choosing a current problem but the manuscript is not really scholarly at all.</p> <p>A general overhaul of writing style is recommended. Serious editing is also needed. The writer should imbibe the habit of acknowledging source as well as bringing in their (researcher's) own stand point.</p> <p>The corrections and suggestions for improvement have been made in the manuscript but the following are highlighted for emphasis.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Title suggests that it is an empirical paper but it is not. Author should consider the suggestion made on the manuscript for appropriate title.</li> <li>2. The abstract should be made more robust to properly guide readers. It should show the need for the paper, what the author intends to achieve and what the author did. I wondered if the writer merely wanted to pass across WHO and FDA regulations and requirements for protection and diet during COVID-19.</li> <li>3. Author should be mindful of their headings. There should be strict adherence to the recommended style. Ideally, there are different levels of headings and the headings help readers understand better and know the weight to attach to each item as well as enable proper understanding/ grouping of write-up. This indiscriminate use of headings cuts across the paper. Writer should please particularly revisit the section captioned treatment.</li> <li>4. Avoid the use of brand names. Rather use generic names/ proper nomenclature that captures the general idea. Refer to your use of magic bullet, Evite trans, etc and use proper terms.</li> </ol> <p>Writer should go back and read widely round the topic, see what other authors have written on it, cite them, compare notes, critique them and then proffer the best idea considering the circumstances. Author should realise that an opinion paper such as this is termed literature review as the design in some circles. They should do a proper literature review then bring out their opinion.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The caption of the figures used should not go beyond one line after the figure to avoid confusion.</li> <li>2. I know that tables should have titles on top, then source beneath. Please do the needful. Authors also indicate whether they adopted or adapted or originated them. Some of the items put under some of the tables do not fit under the heading of the columns. Consider adding more columns with proper headings.</li> <li>3. Writer should avoid one sentence paragraph.</li> <li>4. Be diligent to go through work before submitting to avoid half sentences, incomplete words and outright misspelling of words that are all over the paper, e.g. chiefs instead of chills; antibiotics instead of antiseptics and so on.</li> <li>5. Avoid indiscriminate use of bullets. Stick to the same style as much as possible except where there is need for levels of bullets.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>If author submits to proper guidance from more senior researchers in their institution and follows laid down guidelines for well-researched opinion paper, a good paper can still be made out of this effort.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Obiageli Chinyelu Chukwuemerie</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Nigeria</i></b>