Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases
Volume 20 · Issue 2 · e150150

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluating the Application of Machine Learning in Predicting the Mortality of Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients Using the Confusion Matrix and the Matthews Correlation Coefficient

Maryam Salari, Seyed Masoud Sadati, Alireza Sedaghat, Bita Abbasi, Seyed Amir Zamanpour, Rozita Khodashahi, Mostafa Davoudi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
26 Aug 2024	10 Dec 2024	12 Dec 2024	10.5812/archcid-150150

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 Referee 1 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

1 comment · 13 Oct 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 13 Oct 2024

Dear authors,

I appreciate the effort you've put into your manuscript regarding "Evaluating the application of machine learning in predicting the mortality of COVID-19 patients hospitalized using the confusion matrix and the Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC)." The topic is relatively novel and interesting, and I believe it fits well within the scope of the journal. However, before your manuscript can be considered for publication, there are some concerns that need to be addressed.

1-The study design should be mentioned in the method section of the abstract.
2-Please revise the result section of the abstract with more relevant content.
3-Please improve the quality of the figures, especially figure 3.
4-Your manuscript has some grammatical errors. Please consult an English editor to improve your text in terms of grammar, fluency, punctuation, and style.
Best regards,

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.

e.g.:

- Q: *The study design should be mentioned in the method section of the abstract.*
- R: the study design has been added to the abstract in the methods section.
- *Q: Please revise the result section of the abstract with more related content*
- R: the result has been revised in the abstract section.
- *Q: Please improve the quality of figures, especially figure 3.*
- *R:* images 2,3 and 4 have been replaced with high-quality images.
- *Q: Your manuscript has some grammatical errors. Please consult an English editor to improve your text in terms of grammar, fluency, punctuation, and style.*
- R: the manuscript has been revised in terms of writing, and the changes made in the article are highlighted.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.