

4. Government of Kerala. Kerala: Covid-19 Battle. 2021[cited 2021 May 28]. Available from <https://dashboard.kerala.gov.in/deaths.php>.
5. Ghosh A. Both Covishield & Covaxin work, only 3-4 in 10,000 infected post vaccine, Modi govt releases data. *The Print*. 2021 Apr 21[cited 2021 May 28]. Available from <https://theprint.in/health/covid-deaths-among-people-aged-70-years-and-more-slightly-higher-in-2nd-wave-govt-data-shows/643657/>
6. Ella R, Reddy S, Jogdand H, Sarangi V, Ganneru B, Prasad S, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of an inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccine, BBV152: interim results from a double-blind, randomised, multicentre, phase 2 trial, and 3-month follow-up of a double-blind, randomised phase 1 trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021 Mar 8:S1473-3099(21)00070-0. Doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00070-0. Epub ahead of print.
7. Voysey M, Clemens SAC, Madhi SA, Weckx LY, Folegatti PM, Aley PK, et al. Oxford COVID Vaccine Trial Group. Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *Lancet*. 2021 Jan 9;397(10269):99-111. Doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32661-1. Epub 2020 Dec 8. Erratum in: *Lancet*. 2021 Jan 9;397(10269):98.
8. Special Correspondent. India approves COVID-19 vaccines Covishield and Covaxin for emergency use. *The Hindu*. 2021 Jan 03[cited 2021 May 28]. Available from <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/drug-controller-general-approves-covishield-and-covaxin-in-india-for-emergency-use/article33485539.ece>

Angry email to Reviewer #2

Published online first on October 8, 2020. DOI: 10.20529/IJME.2020.103.

Dear Reviewer #2,

Thank you for submitting your review comments on my diligently drafted manuscript. I appreciate the opportunity to evaluate your review but *unfortunately* (highlighted so you get the gist of this email and don't jump for joy prematurely), your reviews seem to lack the optimism I was looking for.

I think that you address an important issue when suggesting that I shorten the manuscript by five pages and replace the keywords of the paper with something more out of Shakespearean literature. But I regret to tell you that I cannot consider it seriously enough to chop the entire manuscript. Some of the ideas are interesting but I think they would have greater traction with someone pursuing a PhD in English Literature.

Unfortunately, as it would appear to a sane individual not choking on some kind of deep sadistic nihilism, the review process is only for ensuring a rigorous scientific standard not for exercising your spiteful, diabolical, remorseless, tyrannical and Mephistophelian (You see, I do use a dictionary sometimes) power over wretched researchers.

The volume of reviews to my manuscript is usually very high and I desk reject 99% of them. So do not consider yourself special. Since I can consider only a small proportion of reviews received, I must make the difficult decision of leaving most reviews out. It looks like you should read your daily horoscope before submitting such ridiculous reviews next time, or better still keep your tissues ready. Why do I alone have to cry every time?

I believe your literary prowess in reviewing manuscripts will

be better placed elsewhere. Have you tried a career as a restaurant or movie reviewer? You would be surprised to find similar hate for ravenous reviewers in those two professions as well. Maybe you could form a cult and worship your satanic lord with sacrifices of manuscripts that took months to be written.

I do have a segment for general rants on my ResearchGate profile. You may submit your complaints there as a personal message. For public-facing outlets, we can engage in a wholly public debate on Twitter. If you are interested in submitting your opinion to those venues, please create a troll account and follow my given user accounts, to save your professional credibility from this public humiliation.

Thank you for submitting your reviews to me. I respectfully consider it a waste of my time.

I wish you success in finding a more suitable publication to practise the grammar Nazi in you, and I thank you for the work you have done because you definitely wrote this down in the basement of your parent's house after your girlfriend had left you for someone who doesn't necessarily say "tighten the text" every time she talks to you.

I am sorry that I did not accept your review this time and I hope you find success somewhere else in fulfilling your sadistic bloodthirsty appetite for reviews.

PS: Should you completely rewrite your review and include a token of apology along with accepting the manuscript as it is, I would consider going out of my way to endorse your research and review skills on LinkedIn.

Sincerely,

Transfer desk to hell (another long submission process in this case)

Ankit Raj (drankitraj14@gmail.com), Orthopaedic Centre, Main Road, Prasad Bigha, Nawada, Bihar 805 110 INDIA