

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_87844
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDY TO IDENTIFY THE PREVALENCE AND PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF POST COVID LUNG FIBROSIS IN COVID -19
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	<p>The 'article is interesting. It addresses a frequently encountered clinical problem. The methodology is well structured. However, some points need to be highlighted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in the methods part the exclusion criteria should be included in a more schematic picture. Specifying the number of patients who were excluded and the final number of patients who are included in the study. - inclusion criteria can be included in the text. - severity can also be included in a table for smoother flow of the article - ethical considerations can be included in the materials and methods section. -the first row should be defined in table 1. Not sure what the numbers refer to . - results need to be presented more clearly. There are too many tables. You need to summarize the data by reporting them in fewer columns . X² value can be omitted. p value should be kept. in tables it is better to specify lung fibrosis with LF and no LF instead of "YES" and "NO". -The main findings of the study should be reported in the discussion section. - Also more emphasis should be placed on what the 'article adds to the literature. 	
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:	Giuseppe De Carli
Department, University & Country	Division of cardiology University of Siena, Italy