

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78792

Title: Non-pulmonary involvement in COVID-19: A systemic disease rather than a pure respiratory infection.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05562720

Position: Associate Editor

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Mexico

Author's Country/Territory: Egypt

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-14

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-05 19:15

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-16 01:19

Review time: 10 Days and 6 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 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 manuscript entitled “non-pulmonary involvement in COVID-19: a systemic disease rather than a pure respiratory infection” The review manuscript is a great compilation of the available data describing the different organs and systems affected in COVID-19 patients. The manuscript is well-written and organized, however there are some issues that need to be resolved. 1. It is not stated what was the objective of the present manuscript in the abstract. 2. The manuscript lacks a conclusion section. 3. There are several typos and minor English errors throughout the manuscript, please read it carefully and correct them.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78792

Title: Non-pulmonary involvement in COVID-19: A systemic disease rather than a pure respiratory infection.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06368358

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Egypt

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-14

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-09 04:23

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-19 09:56

Review time: 10 Days and 5 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- Whole article must be revised according to the PRISMA guideline. Major revision require.

1. Title doesn't highlight the types of review article. Mention the types of article i.e. narrative / traditional review or systematic review or meta-analysis etc.
2. Gap of the research is not appropriately mentioned in introduction of the study.
3. Aims or objectives are required.
4. Methodology is not mentioned. Method of searching is require.
5. Observations and flow chart are also missing.
6. Whole article is mentioned as an essay. It should be converted in to scientific writing as per the PRISMA guideline. All the matter mentioned in the article except abstract and introduction should be revised and mentioned under the heading of methods, observation and discussion. Final conclusion must be require.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 78792

Title: Non-pulmonary involvement in COVID-19: A systemic disease rather than a pure respiratory infection.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06368358

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Egypt

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-14

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-08 04:41

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-08 11:32

Review time: 6 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Authors have neither modified the article nor give proper explanation for non-modification of article related to my (reviewer 1) comments no. 1 and 2. Gap of the research means the rationale behind the selection of topic or identification of problem for the research which is still not properly explained in introduction. 2. Methodology is poorly mentioned. Many questions are there which can't be answered from this article i.e. • How many articles found as non-English article • How many articles total ? • How many screened/ • How many excluded ? • Reasons for exclusion ? • Inclusion criteria ? 3. Authors have mentioned that descriptive analysis were performed. Many questions are raised which must be answered and also require modification of article accordingly. • If statistical analysis is performed, It should be presented in tabular or in graphical form. • If data analysis performed, this article can be considered as either systematic review or meta-analysis. • According to the structure and matter, this article can't be considered as systematic review or meta-analysis. • Hence, you must have to be modified it accordingly. 4. Mention limitation, strengths and further application of this research work at the end of discussion part. 5. Flow chart is mandatory in review article. Authors' response found positive related to this query. However, It is not found in the article. This seems to be a systematic review article which has its own important and if published, the concluded statement is vigorous for its application. Hence, review article must be accurate and technically sound. Please revised it carefully and according to each and every comment.

Thank you.