

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Identifying common baseline clinical features of COVID-19: a scoping review
AUTHORS	Ferreira-Santos, Daniela; Maranhão, Priscila; Monteiro-Soares, Matilde

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	WEN-JUN TU China
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Jul-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	The results of this study are mostly expected, largely in line with the published studies, and contribute slightly to the current literatures
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Lariza Laura de Oliveira University of São Paulo, Brazil
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Jul-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors conducted a scoping review from papers available at LitCovid, until March 50 23th, 2020. The paper is well writtern and it is in accordance with the PRISMA checklist for scoping reviews. The research question is pertinent, that is why I believe that the paper should be published and new rounds should be made considering new papers until the present date.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Nicola Luigi Bragazzi York University, Toronto, ON, Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	29-Jul-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	The research question is highly interesting. However, several methodological flaws are disseminated throughout the manuscript. 1) The review is updated to March 23 2020, which seriously limits the interest and implications of the review. 2) Which Framework of scoping review has been followed (i.e., the version of Arksey and O'Malley's five-stage or others) 3) How was the research question identified 4) Methodological section should be expanded, including more details (for example I do not see the search strategy). 5) Did authors use PICO/PECO criteria 6) Results should be expanded and re-written: as they are now they are only a list of numbers poorly organized and structured. 7) English should be revised
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1 WEN-JUN TU

The results of this study are mostly expected, largely in line with the published studies, and contribute slightly to the current literatures.

Thank you very much for your comment.

Reviewer: 2 Lariza Laura de Oliveira

The authors conducted a scoping review from papers available at LitCovid, until March 50 23th, 2020. The paper is well written and it is in accordance with the PRISMA checklist for scoping reviews. The research question is pertinent, that is why I believe that the paper should be published and new rounds should be made considering new papers until the present date.

Thank you very much for considering our article as pertinent.

Reviewer: 3 Nicola Luigi Bragazzi

The research question is highly interesting. However, several methodological flaws are disseminated throughout the manuscript.

Thank you very much for considering our research question interesting and for all your comments.

1) The review is updated to March 23 2020, which seriously limits the interest and implications of the review.

Despite the time that has passed since our review, we believe that the main message (the lack of homogeneity of clinical symptoms) will remain relevant and true.

We have included the following information in our discussion section: “and the exponential growth of published evidence about COVID-19 since our review”.

2) Which Framework of scoping review has been followed (i.e., the version of Arksey and O'Malley's five-stage or others)

Thank you for your comment. We have now improved our methods section by adding the following paragraph: “We have used the Arksey and O'Malley methodological framework for conducting a scoping study consisting on the following stages: 1) Identifying the research question, 2) Identifying relevant studies, 3) Study selection, 4) Charting the data; 5) Collating, summarizing, and reporting results (3).”

3) How was the research question identified

Having in consideration your comment we have now clearly stated our research question in the methods: “To answer to the research question “What are the most frequent baseline clinical characteristics (outcome) in adult patients with COVID-19 (population)?” we have reviewed all the evidence available on LitCovid (4)”.

4) Methodological section should be expanded, including more details (for example I do not see the search strategy).

We have not used a search strategy as we have reviewed all the articles that existed in the LitCovid repository.

5) Did authors use PICO/PECO criteria

For our research question, descriptive by nature, we only defined relevant population and outcome(s). We have now described it more clearly in our research question statement as explained in comment #3.

6) *Results should be expanded and re-written: as they are now they are only a list of numbers poorly organized and structured.*

We acknowledge that our results can represent an overflow of descriptive data with highly heterogenic numbers. However, we believe they express the chaos that this topic represents. We would be thankful if any suggestions could be made on how to better organize this data.

7) *English should be revised*

We have revised the article.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Nicola Luigi Bragazzi York University, Toronto, ON, Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	Nicola Luigi Bragazzi York University, Toronto, ON, Canada
GENERAL COMMENTS	Authors have addressed all my concerns.