Andrew Ayers’ Review

Abstract

1. Provide mortality estimates and death statistics as an attention-grabber in the background section.
2. Include a discussion section in the abstract because it is included in the paper. Perhaps alter the conclusion section to be more of a future directions section.
3. Conclusion section is very vague. What does it mean that associated mortality rate estimates increased by 30%.

Background

1. The use of statistics in this section is great, and grabs the reader’s attention. If you are going to include actual hospitalization numbers and death numbers for the entire US, I would do the same for all of Arizona as opposed to just rates.
2. I would discuss the potential risk factors that have been identified by the studies conducted by the ADHS to use as a comparator for your findings. Are you looking for any potential risk factors?
3. Discuss CAP in the background since it is used as a comparator in the discussion.

Methods

1. I don’t believe the initial statement about ethical approval is required or needed to be placed in the paper, but if it is, I would mention it in the conclusion rather than the methods section.
2. Selection of study sites should be discussed more in-depth because the sample size does not seem very representative since information from only two of the 11 acute care hospitals is used.
3. Provide maps to show the hospitals that were considered and the hospitals utilized in the study to show how close they were to the border or how south they were since this is a study focused on Southern Arizona.

Results

1. How were the 306 patients chosen? 258 is pretty small number in comparison to the population of Arizona (7.016 million). Is this really representative?
2. Charts were very helpful, and gave a great overview of the findings.
3. Statement of results was very organized, and easy to understand.

Discussion

1. Should the data be adjusted for age since the proportion of those 65 and older was much higher in this study than in comparator studies? This would give a better understanding of the results.
2. Are global studies such as the ones in Africa truly comparable? Provide age ranges in the comparator studies.
3. Discuss potential bias due to the small sample size.
4. Also, you don’t need to include anything about pediatric care because this is a study on adults.

Conclusion

1. Conclusion is very vague, and could be included in the discussion.
2. Perhaps this conclusion should be more of a future directions section on future studies, and you could provide recommendations on how doctors could utilize monitoring systems to follow-up on patients that have been released for less than 30 days.

Overall recommendation: Major revisions. Encourage resubmission.