Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the retrospective study，The authors demonstrate that myocardial perfusion deficits can be found in COVID-19 patients and is positively correlated with D-dimer levels.This theme is very novel. But as a retrospective study, the grouping is not very clear. The time of case collection was not explained clearly.How to select the control group was not explained clearly also. Tables 1 and 2 can be summarized into one table. Most importantly, there is no exactly perfusion data between two groups.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The aim is stated clear. The authors stated clearly what study found and how they did it. The title is informative and relevant. The references are relevant and recent. The cited sources are referenced correctly. Appropriate and key studies are included. The introduction reveals what is already known about this topic. The research question is clearly outlined. The research question also justified given what is already known about the topic. The process of selection of the subjects was clear. The variables are well defined and measured appropriately. The study methods are valid and reliable. There are enough details provided in order to replicate the study. The data is presented in an appropriate way. The text in the results add to the data and it is not repetitive. Statistically significant results are clear. It is clear which results are with practical meaning. Results are discussed from different angles and placed into context without being overinterpreted.   The conclusions answer the aim of the study. The conclusions are supported by references and own results.   Specific comments on weaknesses of the article and what could be improved: Major points   - none Minor points   1. Please, state the limitations of the study 2. Could you please discuss the clinical implications of the results