

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

Fatemeh Sadeghi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

My comments are as follows:

1. First of all, a systematic review should be written based on a valid guideline such as PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses). It seems that such a protocol has not been used.
2. In the abstract, the obtained results have not been considered. In the conclusion section, it is presented that copper nanoparticles have antiviral potential based on the characteristics and mechanisms of action; this outcome has not been included in the abstract. Furthermore, this section lacks methods and conclusion.
3. In the introduction, no reliable global or local statistics on the prevalence of viral skin diseases have been provided.
4. Regarding the importance of this study and the problems associated with viral skin infections in patients, the value of employing or discovering new therapeutic agents, and the potential inefficacy of known therapeutic agents, the challenges associated with them, and their comparison with viral nanoparticles have not been explained sufficiently. Surely, readers should be convinced that there is a logical reason for undertaking this project related to the field of dermatology.
5. In the methods section, the data have been extracted from limited databases. Other databases such as EBSCO, ProQuest, Bionline, JSTOR, and the Google Scholar can also be good options to follow and check for a complete collection of data.
6. The use of keywords is not specific. It would be advisable to utilize MeSH keywords to conduct a much more powerful search and discover more reliable sources.
7. Sometimes, it's necessary to search in additional languages besides English. Also, the language used for selecting articles should be specified.
8. The criteria for selecting articles, data screening, and the process of data preparation should be explained. Moreover, the determining criteria for the eligibility of a study in the database and whether they are collected or rejected should be detailed. Although preparing a diagram is not mandatory, the process of filtering data and applying restrictions should be clarified.
9. Since the results and discussions are very brief, I recommend expanding on the obtained results. Discuss the extracted

items in more detail to achieve more thorough and detailed results. The references studied for conducting an important project such as a systematic review are very few and not acceptable. With such limited and incomplete data, a meta-analysis study cannot be completed. Finally, such a study not only does not qualify as a systematic review but also fails to meet the standards of a meta-analysis.