

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76882
Title of the Manuscript:	Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-cov-2 antibodies in covid-19 patients in Hyderabad, Pakistan
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript requires polishing of the English language to improve the readability and understanding of sentences such as:</p> <p>“Therefore, this study intends to assess the presence of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 discusses immunity against consequent COVID-19 infection.”</p> <p>“ on August-01- 2020 taking”</p> <p>“ reported to be 99.8% specificity and 100% sensitivity”</p> <p>“In height viral loads in the respiratory tract”</p> <p>“We investigated correlates for seropositivity cases in other population.”</p> <p>“ distribution of all male females and age groups adults those who live in the territories”</p> <p>“ we selected the patients randomly basis”</p> <p>“ detected at the group I, whereas groups II were found positive”</p> <p>“ The current study randomly 1229 patients were analyzed sero-antibody total protein observed 1023/1229(83.24%) were negative”</p> <p>“This study was cleared one point that was more males positive and also correlate china city Wuhan.”</p> <p>“ Some studies reported the medicinal plant as a food”</p> <p>“ in treatment of SARS-CoV-2 in the nearby upcoming”</p> <p>Were there any exclusion criteria which should be noted?</p> <p>The Methods section requires restructuring. The section called “Procedure” should be the last section before “Statistical Analysis”. Every other Method happens before the ELISA in real terms. The section entitled “Laboratory Diagnosis” does not provide any useful experimental procedure and should be eliminated</p> <p>The section entitled “Serology of COVID-19” only gives Background information and would fit better in the Introduction</p> <p>In Results “ 26-45” should be changed to “ 36-45”</p> <p>Figure 1 should include the percentages on each sector</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Byron Baron
Department, University & Country	University of Malta, Malta