

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83216
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on Wearable Devices and mHealth used in COVID 19 Pandemic
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

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The purpose of the manuscript is to present a "Review on Wearable Devices and mHealth used in COVID 19 Pandemic".</p> <p>This immediately raises the question: Is the paper in line with the scope of the journal? As underlined on the Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International (https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI, ISSN: 2456-9119) website, the journal is dedicated to publish high quality papers in all areas of pharmaceutical science including pharmaceutical drugs, community pharmacy, hospital pharmacy ... My hunch is that the paper is not exactly in line with the scope of the journal. Yet, it is up to the editors to take the final decision.</p> <p>As for the submitted article: The topic is important and interesting. The text is balanced and facts - well presented. If the editors take the decision to accept the paper, some corrections and editing of the text are a must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The title is "Review on Wearable Devices and mHealth used in COVID 19 Pandemic". The title is too ambitious as only 28 sources are included. A very good example of a review article at a similar topic is the following paper "Mirjalali, S., Peng, S., Fang, Z., Wang, C.H. and Wu, S., 2022. Wearable Sensors for Remote Health Monitoring: Potential Applications for Early Diagnosis of Covid-19. Advanced materials technologies, 7(1), p.2100545". The text is available for free at https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/admt.202100545. In sum, if the authors insist to keep the title, at least the word "review" has to be deleted.2. Spell and grammar check will help to avoid spelling mistakes and typo errors, including capital letters, missing commas, spaces, matching verbs and nouns, etc.3. For the good order, it is necessary to include the full name before using an abbreviation in the text for the first time, no matter how familiar the abbreviation is to the author (page 5 – CVS; page 7 – FDA...).4. The authors have to cite the source of a text that they put in quotes. Example: In the introduction mHealth definition, pretending to be from WHO is included but the document is not cited.5. Illustrations – check the figure cations again, especially Figure 1.6. Correct the text on page 5, section "A. Systems for Symptoms Monitoring in COVID19" - "...arterial blood pressure > 100 beats/ minute". There is a difference between blood pressure and heart beats per minute.7. If possible, try to split long sentences in several parts. Sentences with 35-40 or more words should be avoided.	<p>Here, we all authors express thanks to reviewer for the valuable comments on our review manuscript. Our feedback with respect comments is as follows:</p> <p>More references have been included and title of review has been modified as Wearable devices and mHealth: The significant applications in COVID 19 Pandemic. The suggested corrections have been highlighted in yellow as per guidelines.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	