

# Review of: "Risk Factors of Pulmonary Embolism in Patients with Acute Exacerbation of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease: A retrospective clinical study"

Ilim Irmak

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Congratulations to the authors for their study. I've some editing suggestions to make the article more understandable.

1. "the mMRC score and last year's times of acute exacerbations showed statistical significance between both groups ( $P < 0.05$ )" In the abstract and results section, it should be stated in which group and in which direction the differences are.
2. The fact that all patients included in the study were not screened for PE is an important limitation that affects the primary outcome of the study. Has D-dimer been examined in each patient? Considering screening for PE in hospitalized patients with exacerbation and examining D-dimer for this purpose should be included in the Discussion section, as this will minimize the risk of PE missed.
3. In the summary section, all abbreviations should be written with their expansions.  
The source for mMRC should be cited in the manuscript and in Table 1.  
Instead of writing [n(%)] in each row in Table 4, it is more appropriate to write it in the table header as in other tables.  
The design of the tables should be similar.