# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**Manuscript NO:** 57436

**Title:** Importance of reporting quality: An assessment of the COVID-19 meta-analysis laboratory hematology literature

**Reviewer's code:** 00069192

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-08

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-17 13:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-06-22 07:06

**Review time:** 4 Days and 17 Hours

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 [ ] Grade D: Fair    [Y] Grade E: Do not publish |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

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The author evaluated the reporting quality of COVID-19 meta-analysis on pathology using IOM, PRISMA, and MOOSE criteria. There were several important issues need to noted.    Major points: 1) The scientific significance of this paper is limited by only evaluating the reporting quality of COVID-19 meta-analysis, although it involves a comparison of published paper and preprint paper.    2) There are a lot of errors in this paper, such as i) In the "Study selection"and Figure 1, "The 27 full text of the remaining studies was examined for content, and 31 studies that fell out of scope for further consideration were removed, leaving 19 studies for the analysis", the numbers were not consistent across this paper; ii) In the Checklists, "and are assigned am identifier through a service such as doi.org or preprints.org but have not completed the peer-review process", there is a spelling mistake; iii) In the Checklists, "Because of the small number of elements in the IOM checklist, a quantitative comparison of studies was not practical", I do not quite understand the meaning of this sentence, since a quantitative comparison of IOM (student t test) has been performed in the "Quantitative aspects of the identified studies:"section; iv) In the "Quantitative aspects of the identified studies:"section, "Because of the limited number of reported elements in the IOM checklist (Table 2), a quantitative analysis and comparison with the PRISMA (Tables 3 and 4) and MOOSE (Tables 5 and 6) checklists was not feasible", this sentence is very confusing; v) When calculating the correlationship of PRISMA and MOOSE scores, it is important to provide a p value; vi) In the "Discussion"section, a symbol "(ref)" appeared in the main text, which is not appropriate, and some punctuations were missing from the listing paragraph. 3) Tables 3 and 5 should not be presented as their forms in the main text. 4) As comparing the reporting quality of published studies of COVID-19 to the preprint literature is one of the aims in this paper, the discussions about this part is scarcely. 5)

The suggestions about the further improvement (the last paragraph) are not related to the topic of this paper —"reporting quality".