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 asssociated 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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**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**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	YES	
Optional/General comments	I found it original, organized, and methodologically correct in its chronology considering a systematic review. However, I have some questions and suggestions to improve your article's publication chances. 1) Did the authors consider using the PICO model to define and analyze the research question? 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. 3) Why was Google Scholar not included in the search in the research strategy session? 4) Has an expert in the renal area been contacted to inform about any article not listed? 5) The authors do not address statistical analysis issues in the study. 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. 7) Did the authors use GRADE to check the quality of the evidence presented in the study? 8) I leave the references to help with the article: - (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.	

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:	**Karen Corsovil**
Department, University & Country	**Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Brazil**