

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80353
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Coronaviruses on Diabetic Patient
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	There is no revision needed	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There is no revision needed	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Abstract, title and references</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the aim clear? Yes• Is it clear what the study found and how they did it? Yes• Is the title informative and relevant? Yes• Are the references:• Relevant? Yes• Recent? Yes• Referenced correctly? Yes• Are appropriate key studies included? Yes <p>Introduction/ background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is it clear what is already known about this topic? Yes• Is the research question clearly outlined? Yes• Is the research question justified given what is already known about the topic? Yes <p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the process of subject selection clear? Yes• Are the variables defined and measured appropriately? Yes• Are the study methods valid and reliable? To some Extent• Is there enough detail in order to replicate the study? Yes <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the data presented in an appropriate way? Yes• Tables and figures relevant and clearly presented? Yes• Appropriate units, rounding, and number of decimals? Yes• Titles, columns, and rows labelled correctly and clearly? Yes• Categories grouped appropriately? Yes• Does the text in the results add to the data or is it repetitive? repetitive• Are you clear about what is a statistically significant result? Yes• Are you clear about what is a practically meaningful result? Yes <p>Discussion and Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are the results discussed from multiple angles and placed into context without being over interpreted? Yes• Do the conclusions answer the aims of the study? To some extent• Are the conclusions supported by references or results? Yes• Are the limitations of the study fatal or are they opportunities to inform future research? Needs Future Research	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sorush Niknamian
Department, University & Country	Liberty University, USA