

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_92709
Title of the Manuscript:	Spectrum of Chest CT Findings in The Patient of Covid-19: Relationship to the Patient Age Group and Duration of Infection, in Al-Dhafra Hospitals, Abu Dhabi
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is an unexpectedly long abstract that should be shortened, focusing on the most important points of the study - Instead, there is a very short introduction, not appropriately introducing the main body of the study eg why do you select to deal with the CT scan in COVID-19 patients? Is this the gold standard of imaging? What are the common imaging findings according to current literature and how often do we see them? - Data collection: there is an issue with the timeframe, please correct - HRCT Image analysis: How did you measure the percentage of involvement? - Baseline information: stage-3 and stage-4 count small numbers of patients. Should you change the staging to make all groups count enough subjects for a more powerful statistical analysis? Besides, do you have information about previous medical history in order to know if there were any previously existing lung disorders? - Too many data, too many analyses, I lost the main message of your study - The discussion is rather short, compared to the numerous precedented data and analyses - Conclusions do not come straightforward from your results - I would more and more recent references to support your manuscript 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Christodoulos Monastiriotis
Department, University & Country	Troodos Hospital, University of Nicosia, Cyprus