



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.sciencedomain.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"> ✓ I consider that the title does not correspond to the objective of the work, nor to the conclusion of the work. It is suggested to change the title ✓ In the study design you mention the abbreviation RCT please describe what it means. ✓ The reviewer considers that it is not scientific to say that the study place for studies 1 and 2 was the office chair where we sit every day to do part of our work. ✓ For study 3 you must be more specific, that is, where in France is the place of study ✓ In the last paragraph of the Introduction, my comment is: ✓ Hydroxychloroquine itself has adverse effects on a patient in the central nervous system such as dizziness and headache. Azithromycin is associated with prolonged use in patients with cardiovascular conditions that worsen after the age of 50, associated with dilated cardiomyopathies that can lead to syncopes. Therefore these factors could be against the habitual use for a patient who is driving due to the involvement of the sensorium and the measure of a patient's reaction to a direct stimulus. For this reason I would like it to be valued what was expressed in the comment in that paragraph. ✓ In the article where the objective appears ✓ The reason why the patients were receiving treatment with hydroxychloroquine is not described in Study 1 for 2019. ✓ In the results of study 1 my comments to discuss by the authors are: 1-Due to the home confinement suggested by the WHO for the Covid 19 contingency, a decrease in the circulation of scooters can be inferred at the time of 2020 compared to that of 2019, which may be a factor to take into account to say that there is a decrease in accidents. ✓ 2- in the Table, only people who were under treatment with hydroxychloroquine in the 2 years are exposed, and without an established reason for said reason ✓ Furthermore, it is not explained why the adherence of azithromycin to said study ✓ In study 1. How can we assure that the 8 people were under treatment with hydroxychloroquine at that time if they tell me that they use it for prophylaxis of malaria that is not a sustained treatment for the year ✓ Study 2 - HCQ + AZT and PSA use before 2020 was excluded from the analysis ✓ This is the fundamental of the work the union of both medicines for their preventive use and you do not present it as a result. What do you base your effectiveness on then? ✓ In Study 3 Wikipedia is not a reliable source for scientific research. ✓ In study 3: The sample is small but they also exclude 3 patients 2 due to falls and one due to death during the tests. It is not enough to ensure the effectiveness of something that is proposed for standard use worldwide. ✓ Study method 3 states that since the study is retrospective, an opinion from the ethics committee is not required. ✓ I do not know to what extent this statement can be considered since in previous studies they always have associated an opinion of the ethics committee. ✓ Results study 3 ✓ As previously mentioned, azithromycin is associated with cardiovascular problems and cases with arrhythmias have been found due to this medication, the patient should have been autopsied looking for this approach. ✓ Results study 3 (I agree that the methodology was not correct. ✓ In Study 3: My question is: ✓ Under what medical terminology do you recommend the use of this combination 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>of medications to prevent accidents?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ In the discussion it is suggested that hydroxychloroquine could be added in the same way to table salt in order to avoid COVID-19 and scooter accidents, however this correlation does not make medical sense ✓ We received the President of the Republic to discuss the results in preview; he was thrilled: (this expression does not have great value in a scientific discussion) ✓ The conclusion does not correspond to the title. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	<i>Maria del Carmen Marquetti</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Institute of Tropical Medicine Pedro Kouri, Cuba</i>