

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80975
Title of the Manuscript:	Psychological Impact of the COVID 19 Pandemic among College Students: A Web Based Cross Sectional Survey
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:

<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 author (authors) deals with the actual topic. However, I have some key comments about the article:</p> <p>Theoretical background (introduction)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - very low level of the theoretical background - only general information on COVID-19 and its impact on the described area - no information on Anxiety, Depression, or tests that the author(s) used for research - no information on the solved problem - the author(s) state that similar research has not been carried out (this is not true, a large number of researches with this issue have arisen - in addition, the author(s) then refer to some of them in the conclusion <p>Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - data of respondents are missing (eg age, type of school studied (there was only one, or they were from different schools), a place where they live, ...) - some of the above data was used for the conclusion but the reader does not know them - there is no information on whether it is random or intentional (then clear criteria should be provided) selection - there is no information about who evaluated the test - what was her/his Specialization (was he/she a psychologist?) - how were the factors selected - based on what? - in the conclusion, the author(s) contradicts: <p><i>"Students living in rural areas, not having a steady family income, not living with parents were have severe Anxiety than students living in urban, having a steady family income, living with parents. However, no significant difference in gender and region was indicated. This can be justified that both Male and females whether they are living in rural and urban areas were experiencing similar symptoms of Anxiety and Depression during the pandemic."</i></p> <p>In conclusion author(s) written, that the impact of COVID-19 among students is low. Nevertheless, the conclusions sound rather negative. In the implications for practice, it would be appropriate to mention the positive and protective factors and how to improve that</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	I recommend correcting the text by a native speaker and experienced translator in the mentioned area.	
Optional/General comments	It is common to format a number with two decimals.	

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)

Review Form 1.6

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Petra Potmesilova
Department, University & Country	Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic