

Review of: "[Case Report] Supplementation with Vitamin D, Zinc, and Quercetin to Treat COVID-19: A Case Report"

Irena Ivanova¹

¹ University Hospital St. Ivan Rilski

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article proposal describes a single clinical case in young woman with Covid-19 treated with supplements - vitamin D, Zinc and Quercetin. The topic is very interesting. The text is easy to read.

As far as is understood, the patient was treated over the phone and probably because of this, no laboratory tests were done. The lack of laboratory data is a negative for the article, more or less. The introduction could emphasize that this is a particular type of medical service (telephone health) practiced somewhere. No mention is made of where this takes place. It should be described what are the criteria for healing in the case of telephone medicine - the subjective feeling of the patient or something else? Methodologically, it can be specified more precisely, because for a young person of 27 years of age, without accompanying diseases, even more vaccinated, recovery in about 10 days is expected. Thus, the need for supplementation remains unclear.

In general, zinc data is missing from the article. It doesn't mention what is Quercetin? Nowhere is it described that there is a conventional treatment, that there is a different course of the disease, which has a bearing on the type of treatment and the outcome of the disease. It has been mentioned that vitamin D is essential for the treatment of Covid-19, which is not exactly the case. If the authors think so, they should defend their thesis more strongly.

Paragraph 3 of the Introduction - describes the pathophysiology of the disease, and the last sentence reports an increase in CRP levels. This is just one of many inflammatory markers, especially since there are both positive and negative inflammatory reactants. The elevation of some inflammatory markers and the decrease of others are the result of the infection and are not part of the pathophysiological mechanism of COVID-19. CRP, in particular, is a sensitive but nonspecific marker of inflammation.

The purpose of the article should be stated in another way, because with only a single clinical case, it cannot be "explore".

Sentence 3 of paragraph 1 in the Discussion ("A natural medicine therapeutic approach may have improved her symptoms and resolved her infection.") - I would refrain from commenting, but in any case it is good to clarify what is meant by "natural medicine".

Conclusion: the article needs a major revision with a rewrite of the abstract also, which lacks even a description of the purpose.

