

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_115330
Title of the Manuscript:	A structured review of renal histopathological lesions associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients with no history of kidney disease
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1. YES 2. NO: Renal histopathological lesions associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients with no history of kidney disease 3. YES 4. YES 5. NO 6. YES	 We appreciate the reviewer's insightful feedback, which will enhance the paper. We changed the title of paper.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 YES	
Optional/General comments	<p>I found it original, organized, and methodologically correct in its chronology considering a systematic review.</p> <p>However, I have some questions and suggestions to improve your article's publication chances.</p> <p>1) Did the authors consider using the PICO model to define and analyze the research question?</p> <p>2) It was not clear who the team that participated in creating the systematic review was. How many people were there? What were their functions? Were there Librarians or specialists on this team? Detail building an illustration, such as a frame or flowchart.</p> <p>3) Why was Google Scholar not included in the search in the research strategy session?</p> <p>4) Has an expert in the renal area been contacted to inform about any article not listed?</p> <p>5) The authors do not address statistical analysis issues in the study.</p> <p>6) Make the study selection stage clearer, encompassing some important points listed in PROSPERO: Study Design, Exposures, Treatment intervention, Outcomes, Inclusion criteria, and Exclusion criteria.</p>	<p>1) We appreciate the reviewer's attention to methodological rigor. While PICO is indeed a valuable framework for formulating clinical research questions, our study did not assess therapeutic interventions but rather sought to elucidate common renal injuries post-SARS-CoV-2 infection through a systematic literature review. Hence, we adhered to the PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews to ensure transparency, comprehensiveness, and replicability in our approach, which we believe better suited the scope and objectives of our investigation.</p> <p>2) To ensure blind, impartial peer review without bias, we have refrained from identifying participants in the manuscript. To address the reviewer's request, we have included the initials of researchers involved in each stage of the study within the methodology section.</p> <p>3) We appreciate the reviewer's suggestion regarding the use of Google Scholar for our systematic review. However, we opted not to utilize Google Scholar for several reasons. Firstly, our focus was on obtaining high-quality, peer-reviewed literature specific to the medical field, and thus we relied on the primary repositories such as PubMed, Scopus, Web of Knowledge, Embase, Scielo, Lilacs, and Cochrane. While Google Scholar provides access to a wide range of publications across various disciplines, it may not always prioritize the most relevant or rigorously peer-reviewed sources for our specific research question. Additionally, we made a deliberate decision not to include grey literature in our systematic review to ensure the highest standard of evidence-based practice. We believe our approach aligns with the rigorous standards of systematic reviews in the medical field and ensures the reliability and validity of our findings.</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<p>7) Did the authors use GRADE to check the quality of the evidence presented in the study?</p> <p>8) I leave the references to help with the article:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- (https://boris.unibe.ch/135129/)- Muka T, Glisic M, Milic J, Verhoog S, Bohlius J, Bramer W, Chowdhury R, Franco OH. A 24-step guide on how to design, conduct, and successfully publish a systematic review and meta-analysis in medical research. Eur J Epidemiol. 2020 Jan;35(1):49-60. doi: 10.1007/s10654-019-00576-5. Epub 2019 Nov 13. PMID: 31720912.	<p>4) We would like to inform the reviewer that the corresponding author of this work holds expertise in the renal field, serving as a tenured faculty member specializing in pathophysiology at a medical school. They have publications in renal pathology and have conducted microscopic analyses (light, electron, and fluorescence microscopy) for diagnosing patients with renal diseases. This extensive experience and expertise in renal pathology contribute significantly to the rigor and depth of our systematic review on renal injury post-SARS-CoV-2 infection.</p> <p>5) We appreciate the reviewer's attention to detail and their valuable feedback. In the initial version of the study, we primarily employed descriptive statistics. However, in response to the reviewer's constructive critique, we have included additional analyses to enhance the robustness of our work. These supplementary analyses are now highlighted in the latest version of the manuscript, aimed at strengthening the overall quality and rigor of our research. Thank you for prompting us to improve our study.</p> <p>6) As previously explained, the inquiry of our study does not pertain to a therapeutic intervention, and thus, the "Exposures, Treatment intervention, Outcomes" framework is not described in the methodology. We collected outcome data at the time of data extraction, and this information is referenced both in the methodology and the results. The study design is encompassed within the inclusion criteria, which include: 1) language (English, Spanish, Portuguese); 2) type of study (case-control, cohort, cross-sectional studies, case reports, case series, clinical trials); 3) description of renal histopathological and/or ultrastructural alterations. These criteria were meticulously defined to ensure the relevance and comprehensiveness of the studies included in our systematic review.</p> <p>7) We assessed the methodological quality of the selected studies using the Newcastle Ottawa Scale (NOS) and the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI), which are two appropriate assessment instruments for the types of studies included in our paper: case reports, case series, and cohorts. While there are other instruments more suitable for evaluating randomized controlled trials, none of such studies were included in our paper. We carefully chose these assessment tools to ensure the thorough evaluation of the methodological rigor and quality of the studies relevant to our research question.</p> <p>8) We sincerely appreciate the reviewer for their valuable suggestions and insightful feedback on our paper. Every consideration provided has been instrumental in enhancing the quality and rigor of our study. Your contributions have been invaluable, and we are grateful for your time and expertise in reviewing our work. Thank you for your commitment to advancing scientific knowledge and for your dedication to the peer review process.</p>
--	---	---

PART 2:

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