

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2421
Title of the Manuscript:	To Study the Clinical Efficacy and Safety of Remdesivir in Hospitalized Adult Patients with Moderate-to-Severe COVID-19 Disease in ICU of a Tertiary Center in Bihar
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript addresses an essential topic, especially given the global impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Remdesivir has been a significant part of the therapeutic arsenal against COVID-19, and this study's focus on its efficacy and safety in a specific regional context (Bihar) adds value to the broader scientific discourse. This manuscript is important because it provides real-world data from a tertiary care center in a region with unique healthcare challenges. The findings are particularly relevant for clinicians and healthcare policymakers who need evidence-based guidance on managing moderate-to-severe COVID-19 cases. Moreover, the study's outcomes could help optimize treatment protocols, especially in settings with limited resources.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is clear but could be improved for precision and comprehensiveness. The suggestion is to revise the title to: "Clinical Efficacy and Safety of Remdesivir in Hospitalized Adult Patients with Moderate-to-Severe COVID-19 in a Tertiary Care ICU in Bihar, India." This will highlight the study's specific focus on adult patients, the severity of the disease, and the regional context, making it more informative and searchable for readers.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract effectively summarizes the study's key points but could be enhanced by adding a brief mention of the study's limitations. For instance, the abstract could acknowledge that the study's observational nature and lack of a control group might limit the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the abstract could benefit from a more explicit statement about the statistical significance of the findings, which would give readers a clearer understanding of the study's robustness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is generally well-organized, with distinct sections for the introduction, methods, results, and discussion. However, there is room for improvement in the clarity and flow between sections. For example, the transition from the background to the methods section could be smoother, perhaps by including a brief overview of the study's objectives at the end of the introduction. Additionally, the results section could be more concise, with some repetitive information being summarized or presented in tabular form to improve readability.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study appears scientifically robust, with a well-defined patient cohort and appropriate use of statistical analysis. However, a few aspects could be improved to enhance the scientific rigor of the manuscript. First, the study's observational design is a limitation that should be more explicitly acknowledged, as it may introduce biases that could affect the findings. Second, the use of a prospective cross-sectional study design could have been supplemented with a control group to provide a more robust comparison of Remdesivir's efficacy against standard care or other treatment regimens. Finally, while the statistical analysis is appropriate, the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed explanation of the statistical methods used, including any assumptions made during the analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally sufficient and relevant. However, the manuscript would benefit from the inclusion of more recent studies, particularly those published in 2023 and 2024. These newer references could provide additional context and support for the study's findings. Additionally, the	

[Review Form2](#)

=	manuscript could cite more regional studies or data to provide a comparative analysis with other regions or countries, which would strengthen the study's relevance to the global scientific community.	
---	---	--

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Language/English Quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The language used in the manuscript is generally clear, but there are several areas where improvements could be made to enhance readability and scholarly quality. For example, the sentence "remdesivir proved to be a major breakthrough in the treatment of moderate-to-severe cases" could be revised to "Remdesivir has been recognized as a significant advancement in the treatment of moderate-to-severe COVID-19 cases." This revision makes the statement more formal and precise. Additionally, some sentences are overly long and complex, which could be simplified for better comprehension. For instance, the methods section contains long sentences that could be broken down into shorter, more digestible parts. <p><input type="checkbox"/> Consistency in Terminology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The manuscript occasionally uses inconsistent terminology, particularly in the discussion of COVID-19 symptoms and treatments. For example, terms like "biochemical markers" and "laboratory parameters" are used interchangeably, which could confuse readers. It would be beneficial to choose one term and use it consistently throughout the manuscript. <p><input type="checkbox"/> Formatting Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">There are minor formatting issues in the manuscript, such as inconsistent use of bullet points and tables. For example, the demographic data in the methods section could be better presented in a clear, well-organized table rather than being embedded in the text. Similarly, the discussion section contains a mix of bullet points and narrative text that could be streamlined for better readability. <p><input type="checkbox"/> Data Presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The presentation of data, particularly in the results section, could be improved. While the manuscript includes several tables and figures, some of the data are not presented as clearly as they could be. For instance, the discussion of CT severity scores could be supplemented with a more detailed explanation or a visual representation that shows the distribution of scores among patients. Additionally, the manuscript could benefit from a brief discussion of any outliers or unusual data points, which would provide a more comprehensive analysis of the findings. <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clarity in Statistical Reporting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The statistical analysis section could be more detailed, particularly in explaining the choice of tests and the interpretation of p-values. For example, the manuscript states that p-values were calculated to determine the significance of differences between admission and discharge markers but does not explain why certain tests were chosen or what the p-values indicate in the context of this study. Including a brief explanation of the statistical methods used, such as paired t-tests, would make the analysis more accessible to a broader audience.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study is well-conducted, and the findings are relevant to the ongoing efforts to manage COVID-19 effectively. However, the manuscript could benefit from a broader discussion of the implications of these findings for future pandemics or other viral outbreaks. Specifically, the authors could explore how the lessons learned from the use of Remdesivir in Bihar could inform treatment protocols in similar healthcare settings worldwide. Additionally, the manuscript could discuss the potential for Remdesivir to be used in combination with other treatments or in different patient populations, such as those with mild COVID-19 symptoms or those in different age groups.</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

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:	Ashraf
Department, University & Country	Pakistan