



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_60013
Title of the Manuscript:	SARS-CoV-2 was unexpectedly deadlier than push-scooters
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:

(<http://www.sciedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issues related to the manuscript, which is required to be moderated, are enlisted below: <p>TITLE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The title of the manuscript sounds exciting for marketing purposes. However, it requires to be moderated. As an original article, the title lacks to answer for the following point. Such as; i. Research methodology <p>ABSTRACT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract is missing a generalized background platform The abstract is missing information's regarding the sample size and justification behind some of the points <p>INTRODUCTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please try to develop the Introduction portion far more precisely & concisely Google Actuality is a source to run the research is not a suitable one by any means Using other images without permission is strictly inhibitory. Please represent the information's in your way. Less number of research questions being highlighted <p>METHOD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The article lacks adequate information's to perform repetitive studies The provided information's require greater reliability The sample size seems pretty low and isn't sufficient to perform any kind of studies Please develop the method concisely. <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please re-phrase the last paragraph of the discussion section <p>CONCLUSION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is further opportunity to research, which is also mentioned by the authors themselves The experiment has been studied from various angles and it has mere consistency, however, it sounds lack of fluency It isn't a good fashion to quote someone, in a scientific paper <p>REFERENCES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the references are required to be avoided from mentioning. i.e.: 16, 2,9,13. As its lacks of reliability <p>OVERALL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grammatical issues, spelling, punctuations are required to be checked all over All of the words must be evenly distributed throughout the margin Please try to develop the article precisely. There is much non-relevant information that has been provided. Like: Study-2 Information's collected from sources like Wikipedia aren't a reliable source to be mentioned, as it sub-standardizes the qualities of an international manuscript A limitation portion must be written separately A table fully abbreviating each of the acronyms must be given 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>INTRODUCTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are too much unnecessary background information's been given in the first two paragraphs of the Introduction <p>METHOD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no need for Figure no. 3 <p>OVERALL:</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The font size of 28 is not ideal. Please try to keep it within the (16 to 20) 	
Optional/General comments	<p>INTRODUCTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also, there is no need to add the 3 different types of studies & their possible outcomes at the later part of the Introduction 	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Danish Kadir
Department, University & Country	University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, USA