

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

Amadu Salau

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Definition of copper NPs as (tiny) is unscientific.

"Properties, small and deleterious to virus", what about data supporting safety in the skin tissue?

If the mechanism of action is specific to viral particles, more specific study examples to justify.

Inclusion criteria do not follow PRISMA nor mention the number of papers or journals used (passed the criteria). The study needs to be reproducible.

"Data extraction was performed to obtain relevant information, such as study characteristics, participant demographics, intervention details, and outcomes", the data is supposed to be shown in the paper.

(Data synthesis section)... though the authors declared that tools were used based on the type of data, they still need to mention all the tools they used.

In "Summary of studies section", the authors stated the summary has been compiled, but nothing of such is presented in the paper about the duration, sample size, etc. Also, they declared that the review "determined whether copper nanoparticles had a significant effect on reducing viral replication and improving symptomatology". The actual data is absent, e.g., details of literature search.

The fact that the lead author is involved in 12 of 34 referenced papers might justify the shabby presentation of data by simply referencing, I still suggest they consider presenting details in all the sections...