Authors: Delian Evrev, Metodija Sekulovski, Milena Gulinac, Hristo Dobrev, Tsvetelina Velikova, George Hadjidekov

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

Imaging of bleeding in COVID-19

Manuscript Type: Review

Dear Editor,

Dear reviewers,

Thank you for your time in reviewing our paper. We acknowledge that our paper might have some issues in conformity with the reviewers` comments. Therefore, we have revised the manuscript using track changes and point-to-point responses to all the recommendations.

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors:

- Thank you for the evaluation of our paper and the chance to improve it.

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.

- Thank you for the valuable suggestions. We tried to implement them all and to revise the introduction.

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.

- We completely agree with the referee and added this information in our revised manuscript.

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?

- We agree and revise the paper accordingly.

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.

- Thank you for the valuable recommendations.

5. Please state the ethical considerations of the research.

- We provided all the informed consent signed by patients, and the study was conducted following the Declaration of Helsinki and the ethical norms of the hospital.

6. Sampling needs further explanation and clarification.

- Thank you for the valuable suggestion. We added information on this issue. The patients underwent routine laboratory testing.

7. Materials and methods are unclear.

- We tried our best to improve this part of the paper as well. We presented a case-series, thus, tried to describe the patients and their characteristics accordingly.

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 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.

- Thank you for the critical notes. We tried to correct this by implementing all the recommendations.

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.

- Thank you for the great suggestion. We have added this.

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.

- Thank you for the note. We add a short passage on this.

11. It was better to use new references

- We improved the references accordingly.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

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.

- Thank you for your time to review our paper and for the overall evaluation of it as good.

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).

- Thank you for the great suggestion. We tried to change this accordingly. We emphasyzed that COVID-19 patients are prone to both hemostasis alterations and risk of thromobosis//bleeding, as well as complications because of the anticoagulation treatment. And therefore, we focus on the imaging as a potent tool to diagnose and manage these situations.

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], ...".

- Thank you for the suggestion, we added a few references here to support the statement.

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).

- Thank you for the valuable suggestion. We cited the proposed paper.

Q4. Any screening processes like recruitment and informed consent to the patient arrangement? Please top up the information in the section "CASE SERIES PRESENTATION."

- The referee is right to point out that. We had been provide such documents during the first submission, but at revision, we added this as a statement in the section.

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?

- We agree with the suggestion of the referee and comment on this.

Q6. Suggested Discussion before the section on the outcome and follow-up.

- Thank you for the great suggestion. Unfortunately, we did not follow-up these patients since their discharge from the hospital.

2 Editorial Office's comments

1) Science Editor: The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it' s ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

- Thank you for the overall evaluation of our paper as good.

2) Company Editor-in-Chief: I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Clinical Cases. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.

- Thank you for the recommendations, we updated the references by using RCA.
- Also, we revised the English language and style.