Archives of Pediatric Infectious Diseases
Volume 12 · Issue 1 · e140944

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Factors Affecting the Length of Hospital Stay in COVID-19 Patients: A Retrospective Study in Bam City, Iran

Seyed Mojtaba Mortazavi, Maryam Jalali, Rezvan Bagheri, Faezeh Rezaei Fard, Ali Radfar, Samane Nematolahi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
16 Sep 2023	14 Oct 2023	14 Nov 2023	10.5812/apid-140944

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission 2
2 Revision 1 Referee 1, Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Let me thank the respected reviewers whose views have doubtlessly have contributed to the scientific value of this article, and as requested the following items were corrected based on their recommendations:

Dear reviewer 1:

Comment 1: The abstract should be rewritten and provide balanced information on the methods and findings along with other sections.

Answer: for providing balanced information on the methods and finding along with other sections, we rewritten the abstract.

Comment 2: Please describe the study participants in the result section of the abstract.

Answer: it is done in the text and highlighted.

Comment 3: The stated design in the abstract is not compatible with the main body of the paper.

Answer: you're completely right, it is corrected.

Comment 4: Please state "provide the high-quality care instead of "the best care possible".

Answer: thanks, it is corrected.

Comment 5: There are some grammatical flaws and unnecessary words throughout the text and abstract.

Answer: grammatical flaws and unnecessary words are corrected.

Comment 6: In the conclusion section of the abstract and main text, authors are advised to state how to utilize the findings of the study and provide a key message of their work.

Answer: you are completely right; we added some sentences.

Comment 7: Authors have stated the application and theory of the poisson model in detail. However, they did not clarify how they used the models in the study. Please declare what has been done by researchers not what is the theory or assumptions of the models.

Answer: you are right, the results section was rewritten more clearly. And some tables were removed for simplification, so that the modelling concept can be better conveyed.

Comment 8: The results section should be revised and provide a descriptive profile of study participants and main variables.

Answer: The results section was rewritten

Comment 9: The second paragraph of the results section (Multicollinearity) should be moved to the methods section.

Answer: it is done in the text and highlighted.

Comment 10: Authors may concise the results of Table 2 and delete the fifth column.

Answer: the fifth column is Incidence rate ratio and it is similar to odds ratio in logistic regression and it is used for interpretation the model instead of coefficients. Some explanation is added to the text about it.

Comment 11: The rationale of model fitting is not clear.

Answer: you are completely right; some parts were changed to better understanding.

Comment 12: The results of model fitness could be reported in another way without Table.

Answer: The table was removed and its result was added to the main text.

Comment 13: The authors have considered the application of the negative binomial regression model. However, they need to consider the nature of the data and describe the length of hospitalization before making any conclusion or recommendation. Accordingly, the strategy of model fitting is not acceptable and needs model running to better address the determinants of hospitalization.

Answer: the results section was rewritten.

Dear reviewer 2:

Comment 1: There are some typographical errors in the text, for example, it is better instead of using breathing rate use respiratory rate

Answer: it is done and corrected.

Comment 2: In line 140, the age unit is not mentioned.

Answer: you are right, it is added in the text.

Comment 3: As you know, one of the most important factors that play a role in the length of hospitalization is the severity of the covid disease. Unfortunately, you did not mention this important factor. Was the severity of the covid in the examined patients the same?

Answer: Unfortunately, we didn't have any information and we mentioned it as a limitation in the text. The severity of Covid-19 among hospitalized patients can be described in terms of ICU or death but this information was not available in our study.

Comment 4: What is the difference between temperature and fever in paragraph 144? Also about breathing rate and respiratory rate in paragraph 216 .

Answer: Both temperature and fever show the same thing, and unfortunately, both of them have been entered into the model by mistake. To correct this error, we removed the temperature and rewrote the results. The result of the model significancy did not change and the coefficients changed very little, which was corrected in the text and table.

Breathing was replaced by respiratory.

Comment 5: You have not specified whether the duration of hospitalization is related to increasing age or decreasing it.

Answer: you are completely right, it is added.

Comment 6: Finally, the topic of your article lacks novelty.

Answer: it is changed.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 11 Nov 2023 – 11 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 11 Nov 2023

Dear Editor
I have assessed the revised version of the manuscript. The requested comments have been considered by the authors.
Reviewer,

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 11 Nov 2023

Dear Colleague
The authors have considered the reviewers' comments.
My decision for this article is to accept it.