Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_82598**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ROLE OF ANGIOTENSIN-CONVERTING ENZYME INHIBITORS (ACEI)/ANGIOTENSIN RECEPTOR BLOCKERS (ARBS) AND HYDROCORTISONE IN PATIENTS WITH COVID-19 AND ADMITTED AT INTENSIVE CARE UNIT**
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

	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	1. The ethical approval number and other details should be included in the manuscript, especially in the materials and methods sections. 2. Change the title to "Role of angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEI)/angiotensin receptor blockers (arbs) and hydrocortisone in COVID-19 patients admitted to the intensive care unit". 3. Even if you chose mild or moderate COVID patients for allocation in the study arm, it is unethical or irrational drug use. Which means, for mild COVID positive cases, if you are giving the treatment arms ethically and pharmacotherapeutically and no justification has been provided for this. So, in your exclusion and inclusion criteria, you must selectively exclude the subjects based on the severity of the disease. 4. Therefore, the methodology part is weak as the study design is not strong enough to produce a conclusive result. The exclusion criteria section should clearly mention the treatment arms, comorbidity conditions like diabetes, hypertension, and past medical history of the enrolled subjects which is very vital for allocating the subject in the different study arms. Thus, the lack of a strong study design is a major drawback of the study while interpreting and thus finalizing the conclusion. 5. Furthermore, the study is too weak to get a final conclusion. 6. In the sentence starting with…..Based on these observations, researchers have advocated the use of RAS inhibitors… here change RAS to RAAS. 7. Patients who needed injection hydrocortisone were older than patients who received ACEi/ARB, 58.37±15.20 and 51.01±90.22, respectively…. I was really shocked to see such a huge standard error… Please double check. 8. Table 1: The statistical values in the table clearly indicate an insufficient and very low sample size. 9. In sample size calculation, which formula was used and what confidence interval and power was used… I think no proper sample size calculation was performed prior to the study. 10. In addition to this, poor data collection, analysis, presentation lead to insufficient evidence to produce a conclusive result.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Discussion section is too weak. 2. Standard error/deviation is missing in the figure	

Optional/General comments	Strongly recommend for English proof reading.	

	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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Shan Sasidharan**
Department, University & Country	**India**