

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79466
Title of the Manuscript:	A brief review on Viral Variants 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 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The article looks interesting but it is lacking some of the key information to make this mini review meaningful for readers.</li> <li>2. Many abbreviations are not explained in their first use.</li> <li>3. What do you mean by <u>unmarried</u> nucleotide polymorphism in the abstract section? It is an unscientific statement.</li> <li>4. Follow journal guideline in keywords, only 4-8 keywords are allowed, use of abbreviation should be avoided.</li> <li>5. Write the year "two thousand nineteen" or "two thousand twenty" as 2019 and 2020 respectively, no need to write those things in words.</li> <li>6. Under the heading Delta, the month April is written without mentioning year. April month of which year? Please mention.</li> <li>7. '&amp;' can be replaced by 'and' in sentences.</li> <li>8. No references are given in the discussion section, although most of the data that has been discussed are collected from other articles. Those articles or those sources should be cited properly in the end of each line. Since those data are collected from some sources, so references should be given.</li> <li>9. The meaning of most of the sentences are incomplete or unclear, thorough and serious revision is required in terms of sentence making and grammar, punctuation, preposition etc. Many technical and grammatical errors are there in the whole manuscript.</li> <li>10. Look at the last line of discussion section "varieties of interest (VOC) and varieties of interest (VOI)". Correct the mistake.</li> <li>11. In the section Beta look at the line "which will lead to the second wave of COVID19 infection in SA, in October 2020". It is a past now. It looks like the article is written earlier and not updated before submitting to this journal. Similarly in many other places of the article, the information should be updated with current data. The manuscript in this form cannot be accepted.</li> <li>12. The 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of Introduction section has been totally copied and pasted below the section Delta. Manuscript with these types of exercises cannot be accepted for publication.</li> <li>13. In the section "SARSCoV2 Variants of Interest (VOI)" no proper reference is given. References are given at the end of the whole section. References should be provided for individual statement, not at the end of the section.</li> <li>14. In the section "Vaccine activity against variants" also the writings are not properly structured, and references are not given properly. Sentences are not properly written and hence are very much unclear.</li> <li>15. Since another variant "Omicron" is occurring now, little bit of discussion should be added in that regard.</li> <li>16. Including a schematic diagram showing different variants, their influence, their occurrence month/year, location etc. will make the article more attractive and informative.</li> <li>17. The work is not properly summarized, more discussion is required in each section with related information.</li> <li>18. The influence of different variants is not well discussed and not supported with related information.</li> <li>19. No Table and no figures are given.</li> <li>20. Under the heading Alpha, "This type of care has been in use in the United Kingdom from September 2020, and it is based on several model forecasts". The sentence looks like incomplete, what type of care and about what this line is explaining? The meaning should be clear and complete.</li> <li>21. Under the heading Beta, the meaning of the line "Tegally and colleagues Multiple</li> </ol>	

## Review Form 1.6

	spike mutations have been discovered" is not clear. Sentence is not properly formed. Similar kind of mistakes are there in many places of the manuscript. 22. The purpose of the review is to study the viral variants, however nothing about the variants is written in the conclusion section.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The topic of the manuscript is very attractive and a thorough review in this topic will definitely enrich the current knowledge of the readers about covid. However, this manuscript is not an in-depth review work on the given topic, the discussed contents are not adequate and also the discussions are quite superficial. The manuscript is lacking sufficient information and convincing discussion for publication.	

## **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>  No reference is given in the discussion section, where most of the data seems to be collected from other articles.	

## **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rajesh Dev Sarkar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gauhati University, India</b>