

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79588
Title of the Manuscript:	C-REACTIVE PROTEIN PROGNOSIS DURING COVID 19: SYMPTOMATIC TRANSMISSION AND CLINICAL MANIFESTATION
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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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 article is poor-structured does not follow the STROBE guidelines intended for cross-sectional studies.</p> <p>The title needs to match with the article, the author mention transmission and symptoms with a certain population but describes what is in the literature and not what the article population feels or explains/describes their disease transmissions and symptoms.</p> <p>The author (in the abstract) failed to mention the population studied, statistical analysis, and lack mention results or conclusions. The abstract should give a balanced overview of what was done and discovered.</p> <p>The introduction section does not cite any kind of reference to back the main article scope.</p> <p>The method section does not state whether any inclusion/exclusion parameters defined, known as eligibility criteria, were used. There is not mention if the study was approved by the local ethics committee. Did the patients give informed consent?</p> <p>Statistical analysis should describe how the sample was calculated, and why the T-test or Mann-Whitney test was used. Ideally should describe any effort to address the potential source of bias. The author mentioned the use of multivitamins and glutathione tablets if this was the case how the variable was adjusted in the analysis. The author mention use of a logistic regression model without describing the variables. In a similar manner use receiver operating curve analysis and both analyses are not in the statistical section. It is not clear when the C-reactive protein was taken into account 6,12,24 or 48 hours or if some patients had different times.</p> <p>The author spends most of the article describing the pathophysiology and only six lines in the result section. The article should explain the groups formed as a cutoff level is used. The article should describe if there is missing data, what time was the follow-up time, report number of outcome events or summary measures over time. There is no any kind of discussion in the work done, limitation of the study or strengths. The conclusion does not align with the results.</p> <p>There are too many critical language issues that include words that does not exist in English as example: "immunosupressent, alverolar shrinklage, asyotomatic, casesto, stronge, LABORATRIES, hyperytension, howveve, wwhen, cororna, downand, transmembrane, yhe, creactive, dymg, thre" It appears that was a machine who translate from a different language. Phrases sometimes are too long and in other occasions are interrupted.</p> <p>Others issues include grammar error for example:</p> <p>"The whitneys methods is also used and we find that the patient who were died due to the corona infection has raised crp protein value in their blood .and we also find that we conducted the cbc test in those patient we find that they had increased neutrophils count in their blood and there also we find that they had increased wbc count and their rbc count were less and their platlets counts were only in the thousands."</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>I imagine that the phrase is referred to the Mann-Whitney method. In this case methods may not agree in number with other words in the phrase. Should be Mann-Whitney's method and the word Whitney's has to be capitalized. The verb is in wrong form, "those patient" must be in plural, "platles" should be platelets. The patient who died not the patient who were died. The word crp protein should be C-reactive protein (CRP) and CRP once explained should be in the rest of the article. The whole manuscript needs a review.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>References section</p> <p>The references must be standardized. Some references are resumed with et al if there are more than three authors but there are references with more than three authors.</p>	
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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>In the study design the author states indelicately that the virus was created by China without any valid proof. Additionally mentions about a "famous scientist" killed by the president. All of the statements are very serious and without support. They can easily be target for legal actions that will compromises the author and can address the journal in an unwanted or irreparable form. No remarks regarding consent inform or local ethic committee.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luis Fernando Escobar Guzman
Department, University & Country	BP – A Beneficência Portuguesa de São Paulo, Brazil