

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

Ali Al-Sultan¹

¹ University of Babylon

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The article often repeats information, especially concerning the role of CT scans and interventional radiology. This repetition can make the article longer than necessary and may confuse readers.
2. The article lacks a critical analysis of the findings from various studies. It would be beneficial to discuss conflicting results or limitations of existing research.
3. The article briefly mentions the disadvantages of CT scans, such as radiation exposure, but does not delve deeply into the potential risks and limitations of interventional radiology procedures.
4. The article could benefit from improved organization and structure. For instance, the section on "Laboratory tests" abruptly transitions to "Imaging tests," making it challenging to follow the logical flow of information.
5. The conclusion does not effectively summarize the key findings or provide insights into the implications for clinical practice or future research directions.
6. The article references figures and tables but does not provide detailed descriptions or explanations for all of them. Additionally, the citation style appears inconsistent throughout the article.
7. Some sentences in the article are lengthy and complex, which may impede readability. Simplifying the language and improving sentence structure could enhance clarity and cohesion.
8. While the article aims to provide a comprehensive review, it could benefit from a more focused approach. Narrowing down the scope or focusing on specific aspects of CT scans and interventional radiology in SARS-COV-2 could result in a more concise and impactful review.
9. The article could be perceived as overly favorable towards the use of CT scans and interventional radiology in the context of SARS-COV-2. Including a balanced discussion of both the benefits and limitations of these imaging modalities would enhance objectivity.
10. The article briefly mentions future research directions but does not provide specific recommendations or hypotheses for future studies.