

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_87459
Title of the Manuscript:	TO ASSESS THE ROLE OF NIMESULIDE IN THE TREATMENT OF COVID-19 INFECTION
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>Abstract</p> <p>1. The objective is “to assess the anti-inflammatory, analgesic and antipyretic activity of nimesulide in mild to moderate Covid-19 infection”. However, the authors did not mention any information involving the anti-inflammatory and analgesic activities of nimesulide. The main outcomes were oxygen saturation, hospitalization, or death.</p> <p>2. The authors wrote “oxygen saturation was also significantly improved in patients treated with nimesulide”. Which results supported this conclusion?</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>3. Please check and update this information “still no medication or vaccines for protection and treatment have been accepted until now”.</p> <p>4. “Owing to risk of hepatotoxicity, nimesulide has been unavailable in the marketplace in many nations such as Belgium, Spain, Finland, United States and Ireland”. This information is for the period from 2002 to 2011 (quite old). Eleven years passed.</p> <p>5. The fourth paragraph in the Introduction section is for azithromycin, a medicine not related to the title and the objective of this manuscript.</p> <p>6. The objective is still not clear.</p> <p>Method</p> <p>7. “The duration of the study was about six months”: from ... to ... ? Year?</p> <p>8. “...the ethical approval by the ethical committee”. The name of your ethical committee? Patients gave you verbal or written informed consent?</p> <p>9. “Adults’ ≥ 12 years”? As per WHO, people aged from 10 to 19 years old are adolescents. Please check the definition of an adult.</p> <p>10. The process of finding and enrolling patients is unclear and insufficient. 66 patients were selected for this study. Did all of them infect COVID-19? In the Results section, the authors wrote “COVID PCR or COVID Rapid Antigen was positive in 56 (84.0%) of the patients”. 56/66 is not equal to 84.0%. So, 10 patients who were not infected with COVID-19 participated in this study, right? What are their roles? Or the sample size is 56 patients?</p> <p>Results</p> <p>11. In Table 1, the total number of patients for rows involving CRP and D-Dimers is not equal to 66.</p>	<p>Dear Reviewers, Thank you for giving us your valuable comments and suggestions on our manuscript " TO ASSESS THE ROLE OF NIMESULIDE IN THE TREATMENT OF COVID-19 INFECTION" for publication in the Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International. I appreciate the time and effort you dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on and valuable improvements to our paper. We have incorporated most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. Please see below, highlighted in yellow, for a point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments and concerns. All changed have been made and highlighted in the finalized manuscript and sent as a separate file via E-mail to the journal.</p> <p>Answer 1: Respected reviewer, the role of Nimesulide in COVID-19 patients was observed in terms of oxygen saturation improvements in all patients selected. Objective has been modified as per our results.</p> <p>Answer 2: Table 2 shows the improvements in mean oxygen saturation improvement in all the patients as a whole and then the subdivided groups.</p> <p>Answer3: Dear reviewer this sentence has been changed in the final manuscript.</p> <p>Answer 4: Sentence reformed.</p> <p>Answer 5: Objective adjusted.</p> <p>Answer 6: Dear reviewer the objective has been simplified and reformed.</p> <p>Answer 8: Mentioned in the final manuscript along with the name of the ethical board.</p> <p>Answer 9: Dear reviewer, all the patients enrolled in the study were above 18 years of age and thus the typographical mistake is corrected.</p> <p>Answer 10: Dear reviewer, few error in the results and missing points have been added to the final manuscript and highlighted.</p> <p>Answer 11: Dear reviewer reason for the missing patients have been mentioned in the results and highlighted.</p> <p>Answer 12: objective and results clarified regarding this point.</p> <p>Answer 13: Sentence changed.</p> <p>Answer 14: Dear reviewer, we have tried our best to clarify this point in the final manuscript by adjusting the objective and results.</p>

Review Form 1.6

	<p>12. In Table 2, all patients received nimesulide and sucralfate, including 10 patients who were COVID-19 negative (COVID PCR or COVID Rapid Antigen). The authors divided patients into pairs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- (1) receiving azithromycin and (2) not receiving azithromycin- (1) receiving enoxaparin and (2) not receiving enoxaparin <p>So, the treatment effectivenesses (SpO2) were assessed for nimesulide or for azithromycin and enoxaparin?</p> <p>The title, the objective and the results are not compatible.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>13. "Our study proved the superior activity of nimesulides over other NSAIDs"??? Which results?</p> <p>14. "Our study ... revealed that administration of Enoxaparin significantly improved the coagulopathies associated with the Covid-19 infection thereby reducing the mortality rate." Coagulopathies were not the outcomes (cannot be seen in the Method and Results sections).</p> <p>15. About half of the Discussion section is for azithromycin and enoxaparin/heparin. This is inappropriate.</p> <p>16. The limitations of this study are inadequate.</p>	<p>Answer 15: Answered as above.</p> <p>Answer 16: Limitation of our study improved and highlighted.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>17. Shorten the Introduction section and add more information into the Results section if possible.</p> <p>18. Check your manuscript. There are numerous spelling mistakes and typos in your manuscript.</p> <p>19. Adding explanations if abbreviations are used in your manuscript. For example USA, SARS...</p> <p>20. References should be cited in square brackets [7], [8].</p>	<p>Answer 17: Dear reviewer, introduction has been changed slightly.</p> <p>Answer 18: Dear reviewer all grammatical mistakes have been corrected.</p> <p>Answer 19: Corrected</p> <p>Answer 20: All references corrected.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No