PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

| statements | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

<General Remarks>   -Firstly, is this manuscript a "narrative" or systematic" review type of article? This needs to be clearly stated as it determines how the manuscript will be generated and written for publication.   -Authors are reminded of the following critical aspects when generating a review article for potential publication: 1) provide a comprehensive foundation on topic 2) explain current state of knowledge 3) identify gaps in knowledge, current research studies and potential for further research endeavors; 4) highlight main methodologies and research techniques;   -I believe the first 3 aspects were addressed fairly well; however, the last aspect(#4) may have been weakly presented;   -In addition, it is unclear as to what was precisely performed to generate this review manuscript regarding literature search and use of search engine along with search criteria; please confirm journal guidelines regarding this very important aspect; this point actually also depends on the type of review" which was performed (narrative vs systematic?).   -Please conform to the specific journal guidelines regarding aims and scope as well as citation numbering within the main text.   -This review manuscript is overall fairly well written; it appears wordy and lengthy in some sections; however, the newly added sight adds to the current understanding of the topic of interest   <Line by Line Suggestions>   Line 31: please clarify what you mean by "imaging" aspects?   Line 49: "form" unnecessary repetition of wording   Line 54: include "status" after 'smoking;' what is meant by "cytokine storm?" please clarify   Line 64: wording choice "evidenced" vs. 'shown' preferred   Line 77: ["...give us…"] --> prefer "provides"   Line 79-82: the aim is stated clearly, however, the following transition sentence is awkward particular by the wording "furthermore…" and thus require re-wording and perhaps connection to yield a single sentence as opposed to two separate sentences;   Lines 110-114: consider

presenting this information as a 'figure or table' appropriately, as opposed to configured into the prose   Line 496: […currently 'conducted'…] --> prefer "in progress"   Lines 505-507: the ending paragraph appears out of place; please modify the content and/or by inserting it into the previous paragraph of the conclusion   Thank you for allowing me the privilege to review this work!

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80192

Title: Gastrointestinal microbiota: A predictor of COVID-19 severity?

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02623966

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Doctor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: Romania

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-05 16:11

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-05 16:11

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[　] Grade A: Excellent　[Y] Grade B: Very good　[　] Grade C: Good [　] Grade D: Fair　[　] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[　] Grade A: Priority publishing　[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [　] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　[　] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[　] Accept (High priority)　[Y] Accept (General priority) [　] Minor revision　[　] Major revision　[　] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes　[　] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [　] Anonymous　[Y] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is an interesting manuscript. Authors succeed to present their data in a clear way adding information to the existing literature. Therefore, I have no corrections to do and the manuscript can be published unaltered.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80192

Title: Gastrointestinal microbiota: A predictor of COVID-19 severity?

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06280507

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Romania

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-20 05:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-09 06:23

Review time: 19 Days

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

[1]   Several typos and grammatical errors were highlighted in the manuscript and should be corrected. 2)   Page 5, line 120-121, the ACE2 whole word has written for second time, as line 115. 3)   The expression of COVID-19 should be written in unique format in the manuscript. 4)   In some lines, the expression of et al should be written in similar format.]