

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 80726

Title: Retroperitoneal and abdominal bleeding in anticoagulated COVID-19 hospitalized patients: Case series and brief literature review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06077514

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-17 01:11

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-26 20:49

Review time: 9 Days and 19 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper used CECT to locate bleeding sites rapidly and precisely and provide prognostic information. The authors also include a brief literature review. Q1. It is too long for the introduction section, and it is unclear to state the aim of this study and the correlation between Retroperitoneal and abdominal bleeding in anticoagulated COVID-19. Suggested extending the explanation on screening this target for this study (How and Why). Q2. Suggested more evidence on "In other words, COVID-19-infected patients are at increased risk of both thrombosis and bleeding due to an imbalance in platelet production and destruction and coagulation system disorders [21],". Q3. Suggested to cite the paper in the introduction section doi: 10.3389/fmed.2021.666973 (for more details on COVID-19 and the medical information).

Q4. Any screening processes like recruitment and informed consent to the patient arrangement? Please top up the information in the section "CASE SERIES PRESENTATION." Q5. For the case report, this is interesting to know the history of the patient background. " None of the patients had chronic liver disease or a history of major bleeding." Could you further explain and provide any study to back up this? Q6. Suggested Discussion before the section on the outcome and follow-up.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 80726

Title: Retroperitoneal and abdominal bleeding in anticoagulated COVID-19 hospitalized patients: Case series and brief literature review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05824612

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD, PsyD

Professional title: Reader in Health Technology Assessment, Research Assistant, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate, Research Fellow, Research Scientist, Researcher, Science Editor, Statistician

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-10 18:30

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-11 21:58

Review time: 1 Day and 3 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection

Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input checked="" 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. At the beginning of the introduction, start with the study group, the dependent variables, and finally, the independent variables are explained. There should be content coherence between paragraphs, and they should be linked like links. The research background should be such that the research gap and unanswered questions are identified for the reader. At least in the last paragraph, state this study's unresolved issues, research gaps, and direct and indirect applications. It is important to note how the results of this study can help resolve ambiguities. 2. To express the purpose, problem statement, the definition of specialized terms or scientific abbreviations, information provided in other similar research, the necessity of research and research innovation compared to previous research, unanswered questions that this research answers, and explain how the results of this study can help resolve ambiguities. 3. In the article's introduction, two questions should be answered briefly: Does the paper address an important issue? Has this research question been raised before? 4. Please write the relationship between the variables more strongly, and their possible impact or effectiveness should be expressed more clearly in the sample group. 5. Please state the ethical considerations of the research. 6. Sampling needs further explanation and clarification. 7. Materials and methods are unclear. 8. In the Discussion, a summary of the findings is mentioned, and their interpretation is described. The alignment and non-alignment of the findings with the findings of previous similar research are compared, examined, and explained. The result then practical overview and



**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>

generalizability of the results and, in general, what has been added from this research to the existing theoretical and applied knowledge, has been written and, in line with it, has expressed the limitations of the study and provided analysis and used suggestions for future studies. 9. In the Limitations section, point out the factors that have restricted your research's internal and external credibility and state the methodological limitations. Make research suggestions based on these limitations and write practical recommendations based on the findings. Avoid making general suggestions, such as holding and explaining the findings based on the hypothesis's results. 10. We consider recommendations for future research an essential aspect of the process by which reviews develop thinking. This article should therefore be diligent in generating new questions that need to be addressed through future empirical research and serve to drive the field forward by posing the questions and hypotheses that need to be the targets of new studies. 11. It was better to use new references