

Review of: "[Review Article] Interventional Radiology And CT Scan in SARS-COV-2: A Review"

Sulaiman Khan¹

1 Hamad bin Khalifa University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this review article, the author searched multiple repositories, including PubMed, Scopus, Google Scholar, and others, for relevant article accumulations. After studying the accumulations, the author analyzed these articles for different modalities and techniques proposed for Covid-19 detection. The paper is well-prepared; however, I have a few concerns regarding the search process, data accumulation, and review analysis process. These concerns are as follows:

- 1. The author mentioned that he searched the selected libraries using mesh terms and a query, so what was the query? Please specify in the methodology section.
- 2. Also, how many articles did you retrieve from each library? How did you screen these articles?
- 3. What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria you followed? What is the final number of articles you retrieved for your review analysis?
- 4. Typically, in review analysis, a group of researchers contributes to writing a review article regarding a topic of interest because sometimes there are articles that are hard to decide "whether to include or discard." Then some sort of voting mechanism or mutual understanding is followed regarding those articles. I don't know how a single author performs this whole process?
- This paper shows research more relevant to a systematic or scoping review analysis, but I didn't find any systematic
 protocol followed in the whole process. Please read some relevant articles and revise your work accordingly. For
 reference, you can read https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2995572.
- 6. Considerable research is available in this domain. What are your key contributions? What is the novelty in your work?
- 7. Please specify your research questions in the Introduction section or in the methodology section to elaborate on your prime objectives.
- 8. This is a review article, and in review articles, the author(s) mostly focus on concise and novel information for their readers. So, I think you should focus on the key findings from the selected literature rather than providing vague information.
- 9. I think you can remove Figure 6 and Figure 7 because these are most common and even available on the internet. Conversely, you can add a process diagram for your whole research protocol to explain your methodology.

Qeios ID: BMUZLL · https://doi.org/10.32388/BMUZLL

