

Review of: "Study of Variables Related to Cerebrovascular Accident in Patients with COVID-19: A Literature Review"

Manal Al-Batanony¹

¹ Qassim University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

A well-written manuscript. I have some comments for the authors:

1- In the abstract, you mentioned that you used 37 articles, while in the results section, you mentioned different numbers: a total of 43 articles, and then you mentioned they were 42 articles. Which was correct?

2- In the introduction, in the first paragraph, you used only one reference; put it at the end of the paragraph only.

3- In the introduction, in the third paragraph, the second statement is incomplete (The number of neurological manifestations of SARS-CoV-2 infection is increasing, which can impact both the central nervous system (CNS)). Kindly correct it.

4- In the literature review, in the second paragraph, you didn't put a reference (Initial cases of stroke were seen in older patients who had previously experienced ischemic stroke, had comorbidities, and elevated inflammatory markers. However, more recent reports describe ischemic events in younger patients. Interestingly, some of these patients did not have classic risk factors for stroke, and some had not even developed severe symptoms of COVID-19 before the stroke. Nevertheless, all patients exhibited a state of hypercoagulability and disseminated intravascular coagulation). Kindly do so.

5- Whenever you use an abbreviation, kindly write it in full for the first time and put the abbreviation between brackets; then you can use the abbreviation later on. Examples: (a UK study, DOACs, tPA, CVA).

6- I noticed that you didn't use the scientific names of the drugs, and you used the commercial names.

7- In the methods and materials section, you used only PubMed, Virtual Health Library, SCIELO, and Google Scholar; delete the word "such as" (searches were carried out in scientific databases such as PubMed, Virtual Health Library, SCIELO, and Google Scholar). Also, it would be better to add some details to this section.

8- You mentioned that you used articles published between 2019-2023, although there were some in 2011 and 2018.

9- In the discussion section, you didn't mention any references.

10- In the conclusion, you mentioned that patients, with others, should work together to fill the knowledge gaps. How can patients do this?

11- At the end, I think that your results can't match all of your objectives.