

# Review of: "The symptomatic expression of infection with the Omicron variant in Chinese patients; findings from the Clifical COVID-19 clinical case registry"

Ishita Gupta

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

This is a large observational study involving around 350+ patients done in China. It categorizes the symptoms into clinical and homeopathic and then describe their findings descriptively. From their findings they claim that cough was the most prevalent symptom followed by fever. On comparing their findings to those from the UK and French studies, the authors find their results from Chinese patients are more similar to the French study.

The paper focuses on an important topic, i.e.. symptoms in patients if the specific Omicron strain of COVID-19. The methodology of the research is strong and the large number of patients and the prospective nature strengths it. Although the findings of most common symptoms could be expected, detailed descriptions of the other uncommon symptoms have also been provided using easy-to-understand graphs and figures. Comparing the data obtained from Chinese patients to that of French and UK patients, gives a sense of further understanding of the symptom expression of this virus.

A few points that could be of concern are -

1. A better and evidence-based definition of both clinical symptoms and homeopathic symptoms could have been provided.
2. The reason to first divide the symptoms into these two categories and then not comment much on the differences/similarities between the two cohorts, is not well-stated and does not add much to the study aim.
3. Use of symptoms like 'brain fog', even if present in the questionnaire used, could be highly subjective with no clear scientific definition.
4. Confounders like smoking status and other causes of fever could have been taken into consideration.
5. Although, an important topic researched on by the authors, nothing new is being added into literature. However, if the authors focused more on comparing their findings in details and providing possible reasons for differences and similarities, this could have been a great addition.