

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59586

Title: Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 65 hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Liaoning, China

Reviewer's code: 04761604

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DNB, MBBS

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Christmas Island

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-29

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-04 10:38

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-04 13:20

Review time: 2 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read the manuscript with great interest and appreciate the authors' work. The paper is important, but it lacks a proper presentation throughout. The study design is unclear to me. Observational studies are crucial in COVID-19; however, they have to be categorized correctly according to its type. I could not agree with the following statement in the manuscript 'A total of 65 adult patients with confirmed COVID-19 who were diagnosed and treated by the principle investigator were enrolled.....'. It is a good practice to credit everyone involved in the treatment of COVID-19 patients like laboratory technicians, nurses, and paramedics. As a clinician, we seldom take entire credit of treating patients ourselves. The abstract needs shortening. Also, the introduction needs rewriting. In this section, please include an exhaustive literature review about COVID-19 from the Chinese perspective. The methods, results and discussion, and conclusion section need exhaustive revision. I shared additional comments in the attached file. Overall, there is potential in your data to generate novel evidence, but it needs to be properly formatted, presented, and scientifically communicated. I will be happy to review it again if the authors revise the manuscript exhaustively. Thanks.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59586

Title: Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 65 hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Liaoning, China

Reviewer's code: 03892684

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Christmas Island

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-29

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-04 15:50

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-11 09:38

Review time: 6 Days and 17 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2
Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?
Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4
Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status
and significance of the study? Background is limited and very general, and does not
highlight the aim of the manuscript 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods
(e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? There
is no real method involved, only basic descriptive statistics 6 Results. Are the research
objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that
the study has made for research progress in this field? This is the major issue: there is no
clear goal associated to the study, only a descriptive statistical analysis of the involved
variables. Coupling this observation with the extremely small sample size, and the fact
that such samples are hardly representative of the overall distribution, the novel
contribution to the field provided by the manuscript is extremely limited, being just one
of the several similar studies appearing recently in the literature. I would recommend
strengthening the aim of the study, adding more comparison with similar efforts and, if
possible, widening the sample dataset. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the
findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and
logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a
clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's
scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? See Q6 8
Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and
appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows,
asterisks etc., better legends? The tables and the only figure are reasonable. 9



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? No real biostatistics involved, only descriptive statistics. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Reference list is heavily biased towards Chinese contributions to the field: I would strongly recommend to include a number of recent contributions appeared in top journal (Nature, Science, etc) providing a more complete landscape and SOTA of the current knowledge. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? N/A 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59586

Title: Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 65 hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Liaoning, China

Reviewer's code: 03397971

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Christmas Island

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-29

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-11-04 12:40

Reviewer performed review: 2020-11-16 09:36

Review time: 11 Days and 20 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reported their experience on the epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 65 COVID-19 patients hospitalized in Liaoning (China). Two groups of patients were retrospectively evaluated. The topic is of great interest to many researchers and clinicians. The paper is well written and easy to follow. However, some concerns should be addressed by the authors. - ABSTRACT, METHODS: the authors should clearly stated that patients were divided into two groups. - The follow-up is quite short. I was wondering whether all patients, included the severe ones, were discharged at the end of the follow-up- Could the authors comment on that? - How many of these patients were admitted in the ICU? - Did any of these patients die during the follow-up period? - The distinction between severe and non-severe patients were based on the presence of one of the followings: shortness of breath, respiratory rate >30 breaths/minute, oxygen saturation $\leq 93\%$ at rest, and oxygenation index ≤ 300 mm Hg. Is that correct? If so, a patient having only shortness of breath with all other parameters within the normal range was considered as a severe COVID-19 case. I think it's quite questionable. Could the authors comment on that? In my opinion a severity score based on the lung involvement on the chest CT-scan should be included and considered for defining a COVID-19 patient as a severe patient.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59586

Title: Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 65 hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Liaoning, China

Reviewer's code: 04761604

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DNB, MBBS

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Christmas Island

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-29

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-20 13:47

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-20 14:03

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Thanks for your revision. The manuscript improved a lot. However, shortening of the discussion is suggested.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59586

Title: Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 65 hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in Liaoning, China

Reviewer's code: 03892684

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: Christmas Island

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-29

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-20 10:46

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-20 17:57

Review time: 7 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

All my previous remarks have been reasonably dealt with.