

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRID_120728</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>COVID-19 and Pulmonary Embolism: A Comprehensive Review of Epidemiology, Pathophysiology, and Management</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This review article attempted to discuss on Vaccine-induced immune thrombotic thrombocytopenia (VITT) and related issues. This can be happened after injecting certain COVID-19 vaccines as rare side effect. This information is important for the scientific community.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>I would suggest "COVID-19 Coagulopathy and thromboembolic consequences (+/-): A Comprehensive Review of Epidemiology, Pathophysiology and Management".</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is rather comprehensive, however, some modifications may be needed if the authors change the title as I suggested.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript needs to be improved. For example, the details of the "Diagnosis" subsection were not mentioned clearly. Some paragraphs may need to be regrouped.</p>	
<p><b>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this</b></p>		

### Review Form 3

<p>manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The references were arranged neither "Harvard" nor "Vancouver" style format. This section needs to be re-formatting. Reference No. (12) and No. (41) are redundant. Reference Nos. 3, 15, 28 and 49 were not mentioned in the text of the article.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are rooms to make improvement in English in this article. Typo errors should be corrected as indicated in the checked manuscript. (Attached)</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Because of the pros and cons of the double blinded/ triple blinded review procedure in this case, the researcher(s)/ author(s) identity and /or integrity are questionable. Certain uncommon abbreviations like ADAM TS 13 antigen should be mentioned in full name in its' first appearance.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i></p>
<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 3

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kyaw Zin Thant</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Myanmar Academy of Medical Science, Myanmar</b>