

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_101222
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of Gastrointestinal Symptoms and clinical outcomes in hospitalized corona disease 2019 patients
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalajrrga.com/index.php/AJRRGA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, any genuine clinical study on COVID-19 is important especially in bringing out the association of pulmonary embolism in this context.</p> <p>Yes, but could be improved as: "Association of gastrointestinal symptoms and clinical outcomes including pulmonary embolism in hospitalized COVID 19 patients"</p> <p>Yes, but the key words should also include pulmonary embolism.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, would have been better if the elements of diet & gut microbiota could be factored in; but then such data may not be available</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Some touch up on consistency of form and spelling is warranted. e.g. spellings may follow the UK or the US style but not jumping back and forth among the two. Similarly a space is usually put after a full stop or a coma, but not before such punctuations.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are problems here and there, quite understandable as English is not our mother tongue. Where the actual meaning is at stake, I have taken the liberty to make corrections in blue print as shown in the corrected version. But sometimes I could not do any correction because I am completely at a loss as to what the authors try to say. (see below)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Example 1. In section "Baseline Demographics and clinical characteristics" 6th paragraph, <u>Our patients with acute abdominal pain demonstrate evidence of COVID 19 incidentally through abdominal CT imaging at the lung bases. All abdominal CT imaging were normal.</u> Do the authors mean "Some (or all) of our patients with acute abdominal pain demonstrate evidence of COVID 19 incidentally through abdominal CT imaging of the lung bases, but all such abdominal CT imaging show no abnormality in the abdomen."</p> <p>Example 2. In section "Outcomes (Table5-7)" 1st paragraph, "As shown in table 6, 3 (8.8%) patients in cases had a complication of ARDS and six others (17.6 %) had pulmonary embolism, this rates were higher than the groups of seven (12.2%) and four (7%) in patients without GI symptoms respectively." Yes, 17.6% of pulmonary embolism is certainly higher than 7%, but 8.8% ARDS is not higher than 12.2%. Would it be simpler to just say that "While for ARDS the incidence of the cases' 8.8% is not significantly different from the controls' 12.2%, for pulmonary embolism the incidence of the cases' 17.6% is substantially higher than the 7% in controls."</p> <p>Example 3. In section "Discussion", paragraph 3, second sentence, "In our study, we...." Then the text jumps to paragraph 4. Do the authors mean to state some point here but failed to key in the sentence. If not it would be simpler to delete this incomplete sentence. (see my remarks in blue print in the reviewer's version.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	John SM Leung
Department, University & Country	St. Paul's Hospital, China