

**Manuscript: “Covid-19 Pandemic Situation In The Arab World Till June 11, 2020: Spatial Panorama Obtained Following The Response Plan Implemented”**

**Submitted: 12 October 2020**

**Accepted: 30 December 2020**

**Published: 31 January 2021**

Corresponding Author: Dr. Fatine Hadrya

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n3p176

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Pr. Fekhaoui M.,  
Morocco

**Reviewer 2:** Blinded

**Reviewer 3:** Janhavi Nagwekar,  
St Michael’s Hospital, Canada

**Reviewer 4:** Prof. Dr. Amal Talib Al-Sa'ady,  
College of Pharmacy, University of Babylon, Iraq

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: Pr FEKHAOUI M.	
University/Country: Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 19 / 10/ 2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>COVID-19 PANDEMIC SITUATION IN THE ARAB WORLD</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:    Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The title is clear and well adapted to the context of the study.</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>the summary is a perfect summary of the objectives sought and the appropriate methodological approach</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>some typing and grammar errors but can be improved</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The methodological approach is interesting and innovative and is applied to a new field.</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>a few mistakes but do not diminish the quality of the work.</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes in general</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Yes the references are up-to-date and appropriate</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>Accepted</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

- (1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

No great suggestions

- (2) Changes which must be made before publication

there are no great improvements except for a few spelling and grammar mistakes

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 19/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29/10/2020
Manuscript Title: COVID-19 pandemic situation in the Arab world	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 10101/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>It would be more appropriate to mention the period where the data were collected and mention it in the title, since as we know the statistics about COVID-19 are changing continuously.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Abstract: a reconsideration of the conclusion should be taken onto consideration, summarizing the results with respect confirmed cases, incidence rates, mortality, and case fatality rates CFR</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The article language is simple and understood, some syllabus, grammatical and spelling mistakes have to be corrected.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Methods are well detailed and explained. However, some remarks / comments and suggestion are to be considered.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>The overall paper is correctly written. One comment with respect to the discussion is to be taken into consideration.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusion could benefit from some revision. The author did not report any further suggestions either with regard data collection nor what could be brought in Arabic countries in the context of the pandemic.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Nothing to report</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

- (1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.
- In method section from “the region benefits....till the end”, this part is to reconsider as it does not fit with methods and what’s it supposed to bring to the reader, it sounds more like introduction. A reputation of this similar section was introduced in the discussion
  - More rational explanation could be added to the discussion to bring light on different mortality rates between countries (e.g. treatment debates, procedure taken by each country....), also discuss the relationship with new detected cases mortality and fatality.
  - Discuss in deep the difference with high and low income Arabic countries (Qatar had the highest incidence rate but the low CFR)
  - When talking about distribution (Figure 1), it’s quite visual that three groups can be distinguished,
    - Group 1: High cumulative infected case / Low decreased cases.
    - Group 2: High cumulative infected case/ Low decreased cases.
    - Group 3: Low cumulative infected case/ High decreased cases.

A discussion based on this distinction could be beneficial to this article.

- (2) Changes which must be made before publication

**Syllabus:**

- In the corresponding author affiliation an “s” is missing → “Faculty of Sciences”
- Introduction: Once introduction COVID19 kindly refer to the abbreviation what does it stand for
- In the study location section: replace Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) instead of Saudi Arabia, kindly be consequent in all document with regard abbreviations.
- Discussion, second paragraph: replace “It is evident, the region” by “It is evident that the region...”

**Spelling and Grammatical mistakes:**

- Introduction: correct to “The aim of this study **was** to describe”

- Results, second paragraph last sentence: as well as the number of COVID-19 realized tests.
- Results: paragraph following Figure 2: correct to “.... In fragile and conflict- affected countries **where** COVID 19 statistics...”
- Results, title of figure 5: replace “as of June 11, 2020” by ‘till June 11,2020’
- Conclusion, first sentence: replace to “Most Arab countries **were strongly...**”

General comments and suggestions:

- The present paper represents the state of the art with regard the pandemic situation in Arab countries during the first trimester of the COVID-19 pandemic. The article will be a plus to the already existing literature and support research related to COVID among the concerned countries. Here are some remarks and comments that the article content could benefit from :
- In the Method section, replace “study location” with “study region”
- In the Method section: you should define the date of the first case detected
- Methods : please refer to the sources of your information and from what structure data were gathered
- In data analysis section: the correlation test was not mentioned and directly mentioned in results.
- Results, fifth paragraph: would be consistent if you mention percentages for others countries too.
- Results, once adding the correlation in data analysis section, you should complete with the coefficient and direction of correlation.

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: November 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2020
Manuscript Title: <b>COVID-19 PANDEMIC SITUATION IN THE ARAB WORLD</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i><b>Questions</b></i>	<i><b>Rating Result</b></i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>It is simple and states the purpose of the paper, however, it is not catchy for someone to take a read</b>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>yes</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
The transmission of <b>virus causing</b> COVID-19 from asymptomatic or oligosymptomatic cases makes COVID-19 In front of this crisis, the World Health Organization??	

Morocco was one of the four countries that has used Most Arab countries was strongly mobilized in The entire manuscript shifts from past and present tenses in most of its sections. I would suggest the authors keep all the recorded data and statements in the past tense instead.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>yes</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>No</b>
Mainly grammatical errors mentioned above	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>yes</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>yes</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	✓
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

- (1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.
1. ‘Some Arab countries have implemented diametrically opposed strategies. Consequently, the spread of the coronavirus is disparate in the Arab world.’ Could the authors mention what might these be?
  2. The data presented is of a mere 6months and many more severe changes have occurred post the month of June. The data worth of a year would make the manuscript have more weightage.
  3. The data presents the number of population in total. A more in depth research on gender population would be beneficial.
  4. What is the likely scenario of the mentioned countries during a possible second wave?

- (2) Changes which must be made before publication
- Grammatical errors need to be subjected along with one tense throughout the paper.



# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: <b>Prof. Dr. Amal Talib Al-Sa'ady</b>	Email: <hr/>
University/Country: <b>College of Pharmacy/University of Babylon, Iraq.</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: 3/12/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b>Covid-19 Pandemic Situation In The Arab World Till June 11, 2020: Spatial Panorama Obtained Following The Response Plan Implemented</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 10101/2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

<b>Accepted, no revision needed</b>	
<b>Accepted, minor revision needed</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Return for major revision and resubmission</b>	
<b>Reject</b>	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

More checking must be done for the data in this study depending on their formal references.