PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61198

Title: Clinical diagnosis of severe COVID-19: A derivation and validation of a prediction rule

Reviewer's code: 03009065

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Doctor, Lecturer, Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-03

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-09 17:52

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-18 18:02

Review time: 9 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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript Title: Derivation and validation of a prediction rule for clinical diagnosis of severe COVID-19 Article Type: Original Manuscript ID: A cross-sectional study Similarity Index:? % Grammar: need revision Certificate of Biostatistics 61198-Institutional Review Board Approval Form or Document 61198-Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate 61198-Signed Informed Consent Form(s) or Document(s) BPG-Copyright-License-agreement-signed Criteria Checklist for New Manuscript Peer-Review 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes, 3/5 the following title may be more attractive: The Clinical Diagnosis of Severe COVID-19; Validation of a Prediction Rule 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes, 4/5 3 Keywords. Do the keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript? No, 2/5; The keywords should be designed based on MESH. More specific words, according to the MESH and the study, should be applied. COVID-19 pandemic; Infectious diseases; scoring system; severity prediction; validation; Nomogram 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study? Yes, 4/5 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes, 5/5 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? Yes, 4/5 The study strengthens the current criteria for the diagnosis of CVID19 severe infection 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 relevance

to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes. However, more discussion is needed. The discussion should present each find in a separate paragraph, comparing the result with other equivalent studies, and discuss the reasons for the similarities and differences. Some claims need references.   Line 265-266 Ministry of Health Guidelines[12], but different from the other practices in many other countries (References?). So far, mild and moderate patients with COVID-19 were encouraged to stay   Line:275-276 As indicated by the research in China and Europe (References?)   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? Yes 4/5   9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes, 5/5 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of the use of SI units? Yes, 5/5 11 References. Does the manuscript cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections appropriately? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite, and over-cite references? Yes, 4/5.   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, 4/5   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? Yes, 5/5   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. The study approved by the local ethic committee.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61198

Title: Clinical diagnosis of severe COVID-19: A derivation and validation of a prediction rule

Reviewer's code: 03009065

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Doctor, Lecturer, Staff Physician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-03

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-01-01 17:09

Reviewer performed review: 2021-01-01 19:07

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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The acronyms (e.g., NLR, P/F ratio) should be extended with the first occurrence in the abstract and the main text separately.