

Review of: "The Efficacy of Copper Nanoparticles in Treating Viral Skin Infections: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis"

Omar Sadik Shalal¹

1 Middle Technical University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

My review

- •The aim was clear.
- •Abstract (133 words) was clear what the study found and how they did it.
- •The abstract is usually between 200-250 words.
- •The title "The Efficacy of Copper Nanoparticles in Treating Viral Skin Infections: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis "was informative and relevant.
- •The references were: 34 references most of them were related papers which is incredibly good from authors.
- •The references must come from current scientific journals (c. 80% published in the last 10 years).
- •Referenced were correctly.
- Appropriate were key studies included.

Introduction / background

- •Introduction (367 words only) was so short, please add one page more with new references.
- •It was clear what is known about this topic.
- •The research questions were justified given what is known about the topic.

Methods:

- The process of Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria was selection clear.
- •The Search Strategy and Data Sources were defined and measured appropriately.
- •The Assessment of Study Quality and Risk of Bias were valid and reliable.



•There were enough detail in order to replicate the study.

Findings and Analysis:

- •The data was presented in an appropriate way.
- •related subjects were grouped appropriately.
- •I'm clear about what is a meaningful result.

Conclusions:

- •Were discussed from multiple angles and placed into context without being overinterpreted.
- •The conclusions were to answer the aims of the study.
- •The conclusions were supported by references or results.
- •The limitations of the study give opportunities to make future research.

During the peer review process, I was looking for :.

Novelty: The article isn't original material distinct from previous publications.

Validity: The study was well-designed and executed.

Clarity: The ideas were expressed clearly, concisely, and logically.

Language: The article was written in clear, concise language.

Qeios ID: KLQKRU · https://doi.org/10.32388/KLQKRU