

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_89288
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of disease-related characteristics in COVID-19 infected population of Karachi, Pakistan: An online survey
Type of the Article	Clinical Practice 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	<p><b>In terms of impact, this article is largely retrospective at this point in that it mostly addresses phases of the pandemic that are over, and is unlikely to substantially impact future progression of the disease. Nonetheless, a retrospective study may be a useful contribution to global knowledge, and may help to beneficially influence medical response to future pandemics.</b></p> <p><b>From a health informatics perspective, the biggest weakness of the manuscript is in offering only minimal description of the impact an online survey has on survey compliance and representative sampling. To address this, it would be helpful to report prior findings on compliance and sampling for online surveys. Do these typically yield slants in age participation , or bias toward specific demographic groups or sex? Are there any possible stigmas that might select against specific types of possible respondents?</b></p> <p><b>Beyond this, I have only minor comments, as listed below.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <p>to introduce a safe and effective strategy &gt;&gt; really, more like multiple strategies</p> <p>The majority of the population 66.1% survived however, a few 9.7% deaths were reported. &gt;&gt; normally this would add up to 100%</p> <p>now it has been disseminated to various countries &gt;&gt; all countries in the world, actually</p> <p>Main text:</p> <p>third coronavirus outbreak &gt;&gt; third 'severe' outbreak in recent decades, maybe? A reasonable fraction of 'common cold' outbreaks are caused by coronaviruses.</p> <p>blood, serum, or plasma &gt;&gt; plasma is a component of blood, which implies they're mutually redundant</p> <p>experienced by corona patients &gt;&gt; More medically accurate to say "COVID-19 patients"</p> <p>5 (13.6%) reported demise due to coronavirus &gt;&gt; this doesn't match the statistic listed in the Abstract</p> <p>Table 4: the 'n' and 'Percentage' statistics do not make sense for the "GI symptoms" and "Loss of taste and smell" rows.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>Gerald Lushington</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kansas State University, USA</b>